ESTABLISHING LASTING VALUES IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the General Faculty Council Committee
on Bachelor of Divinity Degrees in Candidacy
for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity

By

STUART LEDLIE MUNRO, B.Sc.

The University of Alberta

October 1, 1961.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the Reverend Doctor E. J. Thompson and the Reverend Doctor C. F. Johnston, both for their technical advice and for their painstaking efforts in helping to establish a more stable perspective on the subject of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The inspiration of this thesis is drawn from an area of thought of which the following excerpt on a discussion of the Church and Education by the late Dr. W. H. Young,[1] quoted in the United Church Observer is exemplary.

> The significance of these colleges and schools of ours was clearly pointed out in a statement adopted by last year's General Council. It deserves to be read by every member of our Church.
>
> "The aim of education is the development of men and women, the quickening and enriching of their minds, the growth within them of the ability to 'think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgements, to discriminate among values'. Education, then, if it is to be complete, must go far beyond the impartation of knowledge and the acquiring of socially useful techniques. It must look to the development of man as a responsible moral and spiritual being, a bearer of values with an eternal destiny. It must seek to provide youth with worthy answers to life's ultimate question and with a vision of high goals in keeping with his essential nature.
>
> The Church is in education to help young people discover and accept those worthy answers and those high goals. It is the Church's primary conviction that God is, that He is dynamically and creatively at work in the universe and human history, that man is a creature of God whose chief end is 'to glorify Him and to enjoy Him forever' and that in Jesus His nature and purposes find their fullest revelation. The Church believes that it is only through the acceptance of these truths as first principles that life can be at its best for any man, and that therefore education, if it is to fulfill its task must itself be set within the framework of these truths."

A practical incentive has also been supplied by the inactive relationship of many of our youth today with their church. A large proportion of these young people have received education in church programs at younger ages. My desire is to arrive at a practicable answer to the matter of retaining the participation of these young people in the act-

---

1 W.H. Young, "The Church and Education", The United Church Observer, XV, 11 (New Series) p. 3. August 1, 1953.

ivities of the service of God; in the Church services, in Church fellowship, in Church service projects, and in general thought about and application of the faith. My particular concern is with the adolescent ages to early adulthood. I wish to arrive at a theory of a Christian education that will promote a recognition that Church life, as participation in the faith, is essential to the growth of people in soundness of body, mind, and spirit. I would like to point out the necessity of the church in the light of the psychological need of the individual for faith and morals. At the same time I want to do justice to the historical and theological realities in which the most sound scholarship believes that the Church originates. To illustrate, I cite the cases of the Mormon Church and certain fundamentalist groups. Although they have admirable youth concern and moral emphasis, they lose a fully satisfying appeal when the former's authoritative history, and the latter's theology, are examined critically. The Church must serve the needs of youth for moral teaching and spiritual fervour, but it must still stand for the historical realities and revealed truth out of which its precepts grow. The meeting of these needs in just any temporarily effective manner is not our governing spiritual command. The whole good will of God in Jesus Christ is our command. This allows for no flagrant distortion of the whole truth to acquire an immediately desired end.

Although my concern for the young people's situation in our Church is basic to my interest in writing this thesis, much of the resolution of the Christian education situation depends on adult attitudes. Consequently, I also concern myself with the fact that the adult individual

should have arrived at, and be maintaining a commitment to God and fellowship in His Church. My total concern is that youth and adult alike may have a position whereby they may be able to express their own faith freely, live in keeping with their own sense of intellectual honesty, and have a practical and active expression of the same in all that they undertake.

Where the course of the discussion presents favorable opportunity I would like to refer to some of the significant questions that arise regarding denominationalism, the literal interpretation of the Bible, the worship of Jesus as God, pious restrictions of the faithful life, the hypocrisy of mere customary observances, demands for marked spiritual experience, the place of Christian growth through error, and Christian education in relation to science and public education. These matters of discussion need to be considered because of the confusion that failing to understand their place may cause in reconciling many an intelligent mind to the Christian faith. Often highly acceptable views on certain of these subjects are represented by poorly informed Christian advocates as running counter to true Christian thinking. Consequently, we must be able to point out where what are perhaps progressive, but not fundamentally conflicting views are in harmony with well considered statements of Christian scholarship.

CHAPTER I

THE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION PROBLEM

THE POSITION FROM WHICH THE REVIEW IS MADE

The Christian education problem quickly reveals itself as an involved one. Because of prevailing prejudices on the various ideas about what Christian education and its goals are, we must designate the goal as we see it and the beliefs from which we approach. At the outset, it should be noted that so far as this discussion is concerned it will be primarily from the point of view of the Protestant Branch of the Holy Catholic Church (God's Universal Church). It should, however, be relevant to all Christianity insofar as it will endeavour to be true to our sense of God's expectation of all mankind, to man's needs, and to the simplest terms of communication.

Firstly, our goal is not to establish an absolute authority of a particular statement of teaching or an earthly teaching authority. Our task is that of aiding people to know the Living God. We want them to enjoy and serve Him as He gives them through their own hearts and mind to understand this continually unfolding life of unending fellowship with Him, His people, and His world.

Our approach begins from a faith that finds at its core the belief that God exists and that He is personally accessible; that He has created a good world and that He was in the historic person, Jesus of Nazareth, in a unique sense. We believe that the risen Spirit of Jesus Christ

abides with God and still with us. We believe that God as the Father of all, as the personal Son, and as the power of the Holy Spirit, participates in fellowship with man privately and publicly. We believe that God indicates what His purposes for us are by His confrontations and companionship. We believe that we come to understand this intensely personal relationship primarily through God's Spirit (the Holy Spirit) and Son, with us. We believe that we acquire further understanding through meeting others exemplifying His Spirit. We also learn about it through a reasonable examination of ourselves, the world and the universe in which we live, in the light of the Bible and sound deductions from it. The Bible interpreted in a constructive, yet probing, mind and spirit, next to the Living God Himself, constitutes the greatest fundamental of our faith.[1] We believe that God also makes use of the agency of the Church's worship, teaching, fellowship and work to encourage His creatures to recognize and walk with Him. We believe that the home is a small church in teaching, fellowship and living worship. A further fundamental is the practical exemplification of the Spirit in state, business and community life. The fundamentals from which we proceed, then, are God, the Biblical truths reasonably approached, the church, the home, the state, the business world and the community. It should be noted that, however much we respect the Bible and reasonable deductions from it, the church and home, etc., we do not regard them as being infallible as only God Himself is. To us they are at best

---

1 J. D. Smart, The Teaching Ministry of the Church, Pp 117, ll. 25ff.

useful agencies of striving (if frequently frail) servants of God. In fact, we must be prepared to acknowledge individual instances where fellowship with Christ develops despite misrepresentation of the Bible, or decay in the church, the home and the state.

In respect to the relationship of God to the individual, we believe in the priesthood of all believers, or the accessibility of everyone to their heavenly Father(except where, by the conviction of their own mind to the contrary, people psychologically limit themselves). We also believe that for an individual to satisfy God he must do more than passively assent to a church teaching and accept church oversight. For his own spiritual health's sake, he must seek his own personal relationship with God, endeavour to understand and follow His will as best he can. We believe that God has a purpose for the world and each integral part of it, now and beyond history. We believe that His purpose includes every individual and that through circumstances of heart, mind and body He communicates to man, if we look for the indications. We believe that He is pleased to make His presence known through any sincere, honest and responsible church's Christian teaching, fellowship, worship and work. We cannot limit ourselves to a literal interpretation of the Bible, or to claims that any one denomination is the only earthly agency of God's saving grace to the exclusion of others, nor is the church the sum of it. We do not subscribe to totalitarian forms of church government, believing that all Christians have a legitimate voice in the governing of the church

without having to make specific demonstration of particular renunciations (e.g. celibacy) to join her hierarchy of administration.

In the light of the foregoing qualification of the goal and faith from which our approach is to be made, the problem can be outlined. Our analysis will consider theological misconceptions, confusion regarding purpose, psychological insights concerning methods and the sociological aspects of the problem.

THEOLOGICAL MISCONCEPTIONS

Nominally we live in a Christian country and culture . That is, we say we believe in God, the Christ and the Bible. We want church weddings and funerals. We want regular Sunday services of worship that we may attend them if we wish. We want Sunday schools for our children. We will support our church financially and with work. We believe in good morals, ideals, fair play and neighbourliness. We dislike injustice and evil. However, beyond what are practically social customs of belief, occasional attendance and support, we will not go. This is because the wholehearted practice of Christianity is often regarded as either intellectually not respectable or impractical. We can see an excellent example of the beginning of this kind of thinking at the young people's level in our churches.

Until adolescence our pupils are content to receive Biblical teaching and teaching from traditional sources with a minimum of questioning. Until this point they generally fail to sense the frequently prevalent

social rejection of many of the points that they are being taught. This perhaps is due to their isolation from the adult social level. Then they come to verge sensitively upon the threshold of maturity and adult society. They must begin to find a social place for themselves in the midst of the pressures of various intellectual points of view and practical situations. They must prove themselves intellectually respectable, socially adaptable, and morally and idealistically sound. Here begins the encounter of the church with the question, "Where is the followup of the early enthusiasm of young people for the church and their desire for more association with it?" So frequently during this period of rapid personality maturation their church activity becomes very limited or disappears altogether. Many young people may refer to their church background without high regard for what it has afforded them, because of their vagueness about its contribution to their lives. Instead their reference may be one of embarrassment at their own foolishness, their inability to show the logic of the faith, some of the impractical idealism of their teachers, or at having had to go to church school on account of household rules.[2]

Some don't seem to experience this problem. Many do vividly. Of those who find that they have to come to grips with it, some are able to overcome the barrier that confronts them. Others are not. All too often the percentage who find themselves thwarted by this barrier is too great.

---

2 N.C. Harner, Youth Work In The Church, P 23.

Frequently the sense of the relationship of God, the Bible, and the Church to the individual's destiny is lost, and never really wholesomely found again. It is our express belief that unless the individual really knows his destiny in relation to these he does not know what he is doing, where he is going, nor does he have a solid foundation for moral, mental and spiritual stability in society.

Despite the need for an intellectually defensible faith, some would go so far as to suggest the complete acceptance of the Bible on the basis of a naive and superficial interpretation. This is grounded in a faith that it represents the actual words of God. In reality, God does not speak to man in words, but by feelings, figures of mind, hopes and forebodings, and through the guidance of wise spiritual-moral moments and experiences of individuals of our kind. A naive biblical interpretation is not adequate to our need.

Likewise, there are those who would have us adhere to the longstanding traditional views of one or other of the various branches of the church in their entirety. This is but to be delivered from biblical literalism to an even more confining doctrinal literalism(e.g. The mass and priestly authority). It is equally unacceptable. Still others naively suggest the simple following of an unthoughtful conscience or reckless faith in the expedient. This is widely practiced, but still intellectually insufficient to uphold faith and to suggest for the serious acceptance and guidance of people.

These views have made an unreceptive audience for religion, except with the vivid, imaginative and socially unconditioned minds of the very

young. A great potential still exists, however, if we will conduct a liberal synthesis of intelligent scriptural and traditional views with a sincere conscience and an informed mind, in the practical full time living of sensible faith. This constitutes a major need in our Christian Education program. We lack the existence of a genuinely acceptable and intellectually adequate statement of Christian faith. The testimony to the fact is the refusal of most of our society to go beyond its observation as a social custom.

The average person is inclined to this view by his own mental conflict. There is also the considerable influence of some of the intellectual leaders of our time in their refusal to accept the entirety of prevalent Christianity even in its most considered statements (e.g. B. Russell). Consequently any wholehearted Christian approach seems dubbed intellectually incongruous. Nevertheless, students of Christianity of deep persuasion know that within the maze of suggestions about Christianity there exists a genuine pattern of intellectual and emotional soundness if ideas on the faith be diligently analyzed.

We have a real problem to formulate a statement of faith truly representative of an intellectually and emotionally sound Christianity in this latter twentieth century, and to communicate stable faith to our people in our brief encounters with them. Our seeds of truth, we should realize, are going to have to be sown in a bed of prejudice, caused by what has gone before us, but this prejudice must be overcome. To articulate this faith and to present it intelligibly is primary. This is the theological

problem. Likewise it is communicative.

Pursuing the theological problem, we can discover that the main aspects are an improper understanding of God in Christ and Christ in his world. Here is what some call the stumbling block of all Christianity. Secondly, there is an improper understanding of the divine imperative to serve in righteousness unto life. We are victims of our own easy consciences in this day. Righteousness in modern free society has become relative. We do not seek forgiveness and newness of outlook regarding little sins; we ignore them. Even the churches often are not above reproof in this regard. Thirdly, there is an improper understanding of the relationship of the Bible and reason. Fourthly, there is an improper understanding of the Christian church, home and state. Fifthly, there are misunderstandings of the concepts of purpose, eternal destiny, judgement and immortality. An understanding of these subjects is central to our faith. It is insufficient for our purposes that we know only a brief catechism of antiquated expressions or how to follow a hymn or prayer book. Each of us must know enough of the foundation thought of our religion to establish personal stability in relation to the eternal. Each of us upon becoming Christian is growing. We need to know how our attitudes to theology and the Bible can be enlarged to help us to grow . Each of us needs to know how to use theology and the Bible to teach. The understanding of the Living God, the Bible and reason, interpreted by intelligent, responsible people are the highest earthly keys given to open our hearts and minds unto access to heaven. It is the particular requirement of democratic church administration that we all know our theology, Bible and reason.

THE CONFUSION REGARDING PURPOSE

The Christian education problem does not end with a mere consideration of it from a theological point of view. It is also a problem of purpose. From several considerations, this is true. The Christian education competition with other influences is complicated enough without the tremendous burden of not considering what we are doing, where we are going, or why we are engaging in it. We need the spiritual and mental stability derived from solid answers to these questions to be good teachers. We personally require a satisfying understanding of our own destiny. Then are we able to instruct in the meaningfulness of this relationship to the pupil. Our teaching must register with them not simply because of a teaching dogmatically stated, whether it is a part of our personal experience or not, but because by the very virtue of our own satisfaction with a personal sense of destiny, we communicate something deeper than individual mind or dogma. In this manner the recipient can feel the truth and the expression given it in our teaching. The very reasonableness of a soundly conceived idea of destiny which suggests itself with conviction, provides a concrete, intellectually defensible basis for us as teachers and advocates. This unites us with the very purposive movement of life itself toward God's realization of his will in good (the kingdom). We can communicate the depth or dimension of purpose and destiny, if not in explicit articulation, at least implicitly-- a depth otherwise not attained and so badly needed.

Perhaps some of this need originates in almost wholesale rejection of the idea of eternal hell so that the retention of the idea of heaven demands a new formulation of a concept of purpose. We have arrived at no new formulation of ideas to do justice to the highs and lows of human character,as it occurs both within the individual and individuals. We have marred an otherwise simple idea of destiny. There is suggested as a concomitant to the rejection of the belief about eternal hell a substituted modification of the doctrine, yet, it has not been explicitly stated and subjected to serious elaboration and analysis. I refer to the idea of contemporary hell and a limited hell after death.

The society in which we live is resolved into more and more independent thinkers by virtue of its increased education and freedom. Consequently, the whole world stands more INDIVIDUALLY CONFRONTED by the question of grasping life purpose in a particular sense. Perhaps, in the past, a relatively small group of people were able to bring their minds to grips with the subject, give it definition, and submit it as truth under the authority of the church. They had reasonably good hopes that it would be accepted by the masses. Today it is no longer respectable simply to accept the teaching authority of the church or for that matter anyone else. Each person feels required to find the answers for himself, although he may seek some guidance. The desire on the part of the individual to fight through to his personal grasp of destiny and lack of a generally recognized teaching authority on the subject, accounts for part of the need for more emphasis on the subject of understanding the

purpose of life and subordinately the purpose of Christian education.

Another aspect of the purpose problem is that the teaching task of the church goes on mainly through the rank and file. They, of course, can no longer merely hand down defined teaching for this day, for it has neither been adequately elaborated, nor is authoritarian teaching particularly wanted. Their task is to lead to the understanding of what they teach. The difficulty is that though the magnitude of the need has thus increased through more widespread education, the rank and file teacher has yet to be instructed in accommodation to it. His approach is still dogmatic. In fact, it can seldom be otherwise because he has little concrete grasp himself. If the need is to be met, more attention will have to be given to the question of purpose and it should permeate all our teaching. The individual teacher will have to be more thoroughly acquainted with the fact that he cannot simply hand down so many stock answers, but that he must be acquainted with Christian life purpose and communicate it. Perhaps even here the teacher may stand in danger of becoming too dogmatic. However, if at least he is aware of the need, he will not simply expect expositions of moral principles, Bible verses, and historic creeds to work miracles. He may not be able to induce responsiveness to a stock suggestion of the nature of purpose, but, aware of the need, he can at least guide his charges into fruitful channels and confrontations of the subject, where personal exercise can provide the satisfaction of sensing it for themselves. The need for more emphasis upon life purpose and the criticism of the lack of recognition

upon the part of teachers need not be limited to the rank and file. There are plenty of the professional group as well who stand to take it into account as witnessed to by so many denominations and almost as many different fragmentary Christian education approaches.

The effects of our failure at this level are far reaching. Without an adequate grasp of life purpose, the purpose of the church, the purpose of Christian education, and their interrelationships, the church stands in grave danger of being reduced to an institution performing so many material tasks of insignificance --- the contracting of legal marriages, the burial of the dead, and the performance of customary baptisms.

Perhaps the whole world is not asking what is the purpose of life. The thinkers, however, the leaders of mankind, the salt of the earth, are. Many others are perhaps too ensnarled in the basic quest of a livelihood or they too would be. We need to proclaim the answer for the world. Within our churches we need to know what we are living for and what is the particular purpose of the church. We need this understanding, so that a rationally convinced, rather than confused or dogmatic, rank and file may stand with intellectual and emotional conviction in the churches teaching witness. We need to derive purpose from this source of understanding for Christian education. Thus our Christian education and church school leaders may have a sense of direction in their teaching and a sense of guidance to give their pupils. The pupils themselves need to know why they are being taught. These questions are tremendously important in a free

society where each of us has time to think and where we are equals by law. It is important where the rule is not authoritarian discipline or terror of coming judgment, but the reasoned answers to inwardly posed questions, "Why should I?" or "What is the purpose or value of it?" or "What for -- it's a free world?". The ultimate question this thinking leads to is "Why should I live at all?" "Why should I order my life at all?" More and more the rule of life is becoming the reasoned approach to the ultimate question, in the place of discipline and judgement. We must answer the "Why should I?" to the world, our own rank and file, our C.E. leaders and our Church school pupils -- or we won't reach them or have them. Our answer to their particular, "Why should I?" must be an intelligent answer to the ultimate "Why should I?,"What for?" or we still stand in danger of rejection. If we are to reach and hold the respect, attention and heart of our people, adult and child alike, it will be on the basis of reason, and not discipline or terror. (The unsatisfied question of ultimate destiny may even have a bearing in juvenile delinquency that takes root in thrill-seeking.) The interesting paradox of our society of free persons is that we are not really free until we have satisfactorily answered this question. It is one of freedom's limiting factors - the paradox of a free body with a mind and soul that can be shackled not by law, but by lack of grasp. Until the question is answered persons may be led in many disintegrated behaviour patterns which, if persistently followed, will totally destroy them.

Finally, purpose is important to stabilize us in the midst of competitive teachings that we may be able to recognize where their values are acceptable and where they are not, where they overlap with ours and where they are opposed. We and our teachers cannot meet competitive teachings and philosophies and keep our approach steady if we have no basic grasp of our purpose by which to evaluate other thought -- if we do not know what we are doing, why we are doing it, and where we are going, with considerable surety. We need purpose of this nature in coaching young ones so that our teachers may feel adequate to teach and to discriminate in values. Pupils, too, need a sort of home ground to return to again and again from which point of stability to reorganize their thought. Young people are looking for it. Teaching that is solidly related to sensibly answering this need will endure. Persons will sense its enduring quality.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INSIGHTS CONCERNING METHODS

Perhaps if any aspect of Christian education shows signs of improvement it is in this area. Here, due to the unprecedented interest in psychology in our time, Christian education has been assessing the abilities of different age levels to absorb teaching, has regarded the advanced and retarded child, has asked what the interests of children at different levels are, and has tried to adjust curricula accordingly. Considerable thought and preparation has gone into the presentation of lessons to consider the most efficient ways of communicating knowledge -- resulting in pictorial, audio-visual, workbook, and project approaches.

At present we are still entertaining discussion between the relative importance of content and technique (i.e. rote memory work versus workshop exemplification and experience). Daily more and more attention is being devoted to equipment. Christian education specialists are becoming less and less a rarity.

There are still a few disturbing factors, however. Firstly, we are not providing the smooth transition needed at adolescence in moving from irrational acquaintance with the Bible to rational appreciation of its meanings. We are indecisive. We are unable on that basis to call our pupils to decision. We also need a graded hymn book and a graded theology. Our courses need more relationship to specific natural interests like games, wildlife, sports and social activities. Borrowing from the previous analysis where it relates at this point, we are not delving sufficiently into ultimate purpose and destiny in a rational manner at the vital adolescent age when these questions are opening up.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECT

Reviewing our problem thus far, we can relate that theologically our problem is a failure to impart an acceptable Christian faith due to a lack of an adequate biblical and theological statement. From a philosophical point of view we can see our failure to communicate a sense of relationship with the divine purpose and imperative for man. From a psychological view we can see the failure to relate our teaching approach to the critical age of adolescence.

The foregoing constitute much of the internal problem of our own need as Christians to organize efficiently to perform our task. The complicating factor that introduces a note of urgency is that our problem also has a social dimension. Christianity is not living in a vacuum, or a world that is standing still. All the while that we are stumbling and failing to bring people to God, when we are failing to lead people to whole living, we are producing only fragmentary living. The sorry truth of the situation is that there are other competitors in the field of fragmentary concepts of living that can produce as effective arguments for their concepts as Christianity, if that is all that Christianity has to provide. The only proof of Christianity is that it provides whole living. Whilst it is not doing so, then other philosophies have an equally rightful claim to the attention of the potential Christian pupil.

Only the unobservant can miss the activity of these other philosophies making a play for the mind of our young people. The school yard is filled with fadisms and leanings toward mediocrity. We see at work the philosophy that the ultimate is that of broad or average social acceptance. The consequence of this thought, as any observer of juvenile behavior will admit, is often a tragic stifling of individual development and aspiration. At the same time, for all intents and purposes, we have a purely secular type of education. This cannot help but give the impression that a concerted effort toward an intellectual understanding of religion is not needed. The position of the school, however, is somewhat

understandable in the light of the involvements of denominationalism. Nevertheless, the implications of the educational training without religious emphasis is obvious, namely that religion is not an important factor in the business of preparing for life, not when it comes to the matter of getting down to work and to the running of a home. The impression is presented that like poetry, music and drama, religion is interesting entertainment, but when it comes down to the practical, it is not an essential. At the same time the school attempts to groom morals, discipline and character. The attempt falls short, since it is either haphazard, or in most cases without the spiritual foundation for the morality or character that it is designed to impart.

The child is, of course, not only affected by his own social group, but also by the tempo of adult society that he observes. Here, when he is not grasped by the unifying tendency of Christian philosophy, he tends to be swept by the more immediately sensational, but fragmentary, philosophies of expediency and humanism. He can see exemplified the philosophy of, "you've got to make a living". He can see also, the witnessing to the philosophy that man only lives once. He is influenced by the trend of these philosophies to lose the spirit of morals and character, to win the game at all costs, or to get to the top at all costs. He is subject to the pressures, "you've got to have this possession to live at all", " it takes a bottle to make a good time", (and at that a whole hog portion) "if you're smart you don't get caught", (as if life has lost its larger judgement).

The individual is also exposed to the results of these philosophies as they end up in meaninglessness and tragedy, in accusation inwardly and socially for the wrongs committed. The individual meets the philosophy of despair that manifests itself in a suspicion of others, a persecution complex that assures the individual that others are getting away with what he gets caught at. He is subject to the philosophy of science and mechanism. The world becomes a great machine -- economic, technological and political, where the sense of worth of the individual is swallowed up and forgotten in the interests of great human plans and systems devised to the advantage of a privileged few.

In the light of these fragmentary influences, few of which clearly expose their own error, except when measured by a higher standard, Christianity is solemnly obliged to lead to whole living and a philosophy of wholeness in living.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER ONE

The Christian education problem is manifold; the need for world-wide Christian education and evangelization, the need for a reconciliation of the world to a genuine grasp of Christianity (particularly among those who ostensibly constitute the church), the need for clear, comprehensive definition and sanity in evangelizing to Christianity, the need for education to a higher and growing concept of God and Christ in respect to the Bible, reason, church, home, state, business and community, the need for encouragement to commit ourselves to what we do believe and know about God at every given moment preparatory to continuous growth in

spiritual experience.

In respect to youth, the church is logically concerned about the contribution to poor youth conditions that we have made through a failure to truly educate many young people who have been within our sphere of influence. It is further concerned over our failure to appeal to other youth beyond the church because of the failure with some of our own. Our failure with youth is the result of our inability to present a whole picture of life. We have not presented a sense of life purpose to the individual or related our teaching to its clarification and fulfilment. In a haste to acquire church members we have often failed to educate at all or to call prospective members to a complete committment to God as they understand him,and to include a proviso that they prepare for continuing growth in theological understanding.

We have presented fragmentary religion, a nice social custom for Sundays (not a seven day imperative),as a competitor among other fragmentary philosophies. Our true obligation as genuine Christians is to present a picture of living couched in a temporal and eternal destiny.

CHAPTER II

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT

In the preceding examination of the Christian education problem several points were brought out. One, the failure to cultivate comprehension and understanding in respect to: the Living God, the Biblical teaching, the relation of religion to church, home and state. Two, the need for a grasp of the purposes of life, the church, and Christian education, as an overall directive for teachers in guiding pupils. Three, the psychological problem of setting our teaching of these truths in a context where they become obviously vital to the need of the individual at the age when the questions of discriminating thinking are arising. The problem was indicated to be further complicated and confused by conflicting philosophies and fragmentary ideas of Christianity.

In historical retrospect we discover that Christianity is burdened and enlightened to a considerable extent by the problems, hopes, and methods bequeathed from earlier ages. Christianity is a religion nearly two thousand years old in a world that is much older. The matter of Christian education has been of considerable importance ever since the religion's inception. It is apparent upon examination that some of its problems and hopes are rooted in earlier times.

When we look to history for part of the explanation of the Christian education situation we are first required to deal with the problem of religious education in general, rather than just Christian education.

Inasmuch as the central instrument of our faith, the Bible, grows out of a Hebrew heritage and reflects to no small extent its background,[1] we need to come to grips with Hebrew religious education techniques that may have been transmitted to early Christianity. Considering the great extent to which the Hebrews concentrated upon religion, it is natural to expect that the Hebrews had a plan for religious education. Proceeding chronologically, we will direct our attention specifically to Christian education as it was initiated by Jesus. Then we will consider the further developments by the ancient church, the medieval church, the reformation church and the modern church.

Our faith has taken its deepest roots in the person and teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the early church. It is only logical that we should examine the teaching of these times. Jesus, short as his ministry was, appears to have had a teaching plan in preparing his disciples to carry his message.[2] The early church thrown into a wider world of various religions, philosophies, states and schismatics, and a world destined to last longer than either Jesus or the early church first expected, was forced to elaborate definitive positions in her teaching approach and plan of instruction. The early church was soon introduced to the problem of preserving the unity of Christian families in the advance of growing numbers of children of Christian parentage unfamiliar with the faith. (It is interesting to note that similar to present Protestant Christian education, teaching was a function of church and home.)

The medieval church, the church in reformation, and the modern church

---

1 A. Jeffrey, "The Canon of the Old Testament", "The Interpreters Bible, I, p. 32, ll. 15ff

2 L. J. Sherrill, The Rise of Christian Education, p.92, l.21ff

have all had their approaches to education though some of their aspects would appear to be more like retrogressions that improvements. Nevertheless, we shall review them for what light they can afford our situation. We are fair only if we judge each approach by the opportunity afforded it and the time preceding.

Our approach for this study will be to look to the basic impetus to educate in religion, and in particular Christianity. Firstly, we will examine the religious quest of man the world over, and what we can conclude from that. We will then look to our preference of Judaeo-Christianity over other great world religions, and to the history of Jewish and Christian institutions of religious education and their practices.

THE BASIC RELIGIOUS QUEST AND THE IMPETUS TO EDUCATE

The human quest for religious knowledge would appear to begin in the uncertainities of life,[3] the inward experiences of right and wrong,[4] and in the experience of being at peace or at odds with life. We can make note of other experiences that also have a bearing on this quest. There is the fact of coming to the knowledge of our own finiteness in a vast world. There is our speculation upon the beginning and the end of the world in reference to the fact that other fragments of life about us seem to have beginning and end. There is the desire to lay hold upon consistently appreciable values that are unaffected by circumstance.[5]

---

3 T. W. Manson, A Companion To The Bible, P. 274
4 Genesis 3:8-11
5 Genesis 3:23-24

There is the act of speculating upon what makes the character qualities that are a part of the people whom we admire and would like to resemble. There is the desire to establish worth, place and self expression in life. There is the desire to lay hold upon lasting, if possible everlasting, security.

As children we escape taking much of this questioning into consideration. However, we do become conscious of a sense of right and wrong. We have a sense of wonderment. We know ecstasy and great expectation. We know a sense of daring. We recognize ups and downs and that there seems to be an unpredictable quality about them.

At various stages of our latter maturation, however, we are brought face to face with certain situations of social law and justice, fears, sicknesses, pain, birth and death. We experience a development of mind that makes it impossible to neglect the questions they raise. To fail to meet these questions with satisfactory answers of faith would seem to leave a blank in our organization to meet life. It might lead to our own degradation in bitterness, escapism, the ignorance of assuming that such things as shook us yesterday won't happen again , or that the problems we experience are somebody else's fault. As maturing people, then, we begin to speculate upon the existence of a Supreme Being and that He has a purpose or will that runs its course and is to be served. We may wonder whether He makes himself known. We may go farther and ask, how does He make himself known? What is his will and how does He make it known? How can we lay hold upon the really important and lasting values of life?

At this point we consciously begin to orient ourselves to life as a whole, and to orient our thinking, so as to satisfactorily answer these questions. (We do well to remember that in view of the meaninglessness, confusion and despair involved as the consequence of not answering these questions satisfactorily, satisfactory answers to them are in reality needs, not simply matters of interest that do not vitally affect us.) When we have achieved a reasonably satisfactory orientation, we experience a valuable sense of unity, direction and faith in life. We are thereby rendered capable of anticipating the needs of others in this respect. We recognize that there is an answer to be found, a hurdle to be overcome by all people. We know that there is a value in being constructively prepared for it, either by virtue of the value that preparation has played in our lives, or because lack of preparation has made the preliminary period to the orientation experience very difficult or shocking. We also recognize that in anticipating and helping to meet the needs of others, children, teen-agers, or adults we see more clearly, and are able to cope more satisfactorily with our own needs. These factors constitute the basis of a personal spiritual experience which is certainly a major factor in solid and deep-rooted interest in educating religiously. It is a logical completion of the customary inclination of parent or society to regard religion as a good thing.

Our own experience of the reality of God and our orientation about it may be the most powerful and persistent force toward personal conviction and the interest to educate, but we also need to employ the knowledge and accounts that we possess of the spiritual experience and orientation.

of other people to complete our knowledge of the breadth and depth of things spiritual. This is where we turn to the Bible, the church, historical events of religious thought, pro and con. At this point the Bible and church knowledge do not so much introduce us to a new experience of God. Rather they give us a sound teaching of the faith to present; further they help us to establish great turning or focal points around which to associate, organize, and interpret our own present day to day spiritual experiences. This we do in relation to others of our time and the past. We are rendered capable of enjoying through a sharing of the knowledge of the personal spiritual experience of God a close relationship with others. At the same time, we are laying a continuous groundwork for the similar association of other persons with us in the future.

Whilst our spiritual experience leads us to the Bible and the church, the deepening of our knowledge of the biblical and church statements of the truth lead back to our experience of God. Though it may be subtle and considerably in the background, this experience is assuming an ever-growing magnitude. The Bible and church may not in themselves build a new relationship with God, but they fill a very necessary place in completing a program of understanding the God-With-Man fellowship that really flourishes through a personal subjective confrontation by the Almighty Himself.

Evidence supports that the religious quest exists the world over. Wherever we go we see signs of religion, some religions being more primitive than others.[6] In Judaeo-Christianity, however, we feel that there is propounded a unique answer or group of answers to help us to understand our spiritual relationship with God. Christian teaching explicitly

---

6 J. B. Sparks, The Histomap of Religion, Rand McNally

speaks of the participation of God in human relations, pointing to the prophecy of, and the historic existence of Jesus Christ. His consistent strength of character, even to the point of death, points to the presence of God's power with man. Jesus' association with man, while enjoying association with God, indicates the closeness of God with man, even in man's man to man relationships. Christian teaching forthrightly bespeaks the existence of God's personal will and purpose for each individual. Christ concretely exemplifies the nature of God and indicates the manner in which we lay hold upon the lasting values of life and eternal life. Christian teaching declares its people to be particularly used of God to render theological insights.

The direction offered human endeavour and service is toward God's supra-historical kingdom at that point where the contemporary deed by its righteousness fuses with the eternal. Thus man is offered one who is concerned with man himself, who in that relationship strengthens man and accompanies him into the very tedium of life. He is further offered a worthy vision of God, and an indication of how he may know eternal life. He is presented with an opportunity to work in a manner that is not of passing, but lasting value, where the end need not be himself, but where he can be a servant of his fellows whilst a servant of God.

In these experiences and assumptions our Christian education premises originate. We will look, however, to the history of the origin of religious education in Judaism, and its development in ensuing periods of Christianity, in seeking to better understand the factors involved in searching for a relevant Christian education for our day.

AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF JUDAO-CHRISTIAN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

History indicates that religious education reaches well back before the Christian era. We have evidence of religious quest among the most primitive peoples. Ideally speaking, as the religious understanding developed the religious outlook grew more satisfying. Otherwise the religion began to become of less influence.[7] In some cases, however, the primarily religious element was lost to the philosophical approach. This seems to be the case with the Buddhist religion.[8] Love is recognized in intellectual assent, but not worshipped as personality and as the nature of the entire creation's driving force. There is, too, to this day, the worship of elemental and solar objects. The theological shortcomings of these positions are most notably, who is our maker, how does He communicate Himself, what is the one unifying factor behind all that takes and gives it meaning? Certainly more than a philosophy, man made, is required to communicate a personal relationship with the power of creation. We require the presence of God Himself for that. Certainly we were created by more than sun or moon or man-made idols or ideals. Theologically, the oriental religions show evidence of the religious quest, but they fail to dwell upon a satisfactory knowledge of God, and

---

7 J. B. Spark, Histomap of Religion. Rand McNally and Co.

8 Forman and Gammon, Truth Is One. Pp 43, 46

they have failed to initiate a constructive spirit among their peoples. In Judaism, from which spring also Islam and Christianity, a distinct theological development is in evidence. The primitive beliefs in God have evolved from a diverse worship of various spirits to a unity.[9] Worship has moved from the worship of mystery and power, to justice,[10] graciousness,[11] and an inwardly found spirit.[12] A distinct lack, however, is to be noticed in the failure of universalism to transcend nationalism.[13] The crux of the matter of religious progress seems to be that, by and large, man has been endowed with a sense of religious quest. Man has a choice of where he will reach to satisfy his quest. He may emphasize the transcendent spirit, the imminent spirit, his own wisdom, or the objects of the universe. He may fall down before these self imposed limitations upon his understanding of God, or he may open his heart, mind and life to the person and will of the wholeness of the indwelling and overarching, historical and suprahistorical, gracious and sovereign God himself, in all his variations of person.

Why among all men the Jews gained the unique beginnings of theological insight that they did can only be accepted as the particular purpose of God. But the designation of persons is not so strange. The fact that Edison was given the insight that led to his great inventions was also

---

9 Deut. 6:4
10 Amos 5:5
11 Hosea 11:8-9
12 Psalm 139
13 Jonah, Luke 10:29-37

God's particular purpose, and few would especially question why not somebody other than Edison. We just accept it and go on. The same applies to the unique significance of the early Jews.

The Hebrews received their basic thought from priestly, prophetic, wisdom, and poetic influence. The priest sought to mediate through ritual act and divination.[14] The prophet sought to declare the will of God and to raise his people to a new theological, moral and historical vision.[15] The sage tried to distill life's experiences into concentrated drops. We find their influence in the proverbs.[16] The poet imparted his message throught beautiful word form, embodying theologically appealing thought. His influence is most notable in the Psalms.[17]

The Hebrew family was not disturbed by complex society.[18] Religion was a strengthening element of the family. In the family scene it was religiously asserted that to labor was to perform part of the will of God. The father was expected to govern the children's behavior. Behaviour was regarded as moral, also as part of God's will. The father was to make known the oral tradition to his fold. This meant the teaching of the law and the history.

Ritual acts were also performed in the family, stimulating the curiosity of the children.[19] The explanation of these same acts to the

---

14 Judges 17, 18, T. W. Manson, A Companion to The Bible. p.427, Line 11 ff.
15 Isaiah 1,2,8:5,9:1-7
16 Proverbs 2,3
17 Psalms 23,100,121
18 L. J. Sherrill, The Rise Of Christian Education, p.17, l.26ff
19 Ibid. p. 22, l.7ff

children kept the insight of the parent keen, particularly in the likelihood of existing conflicts in prophetic and priestly schools of thought. The sabbath was also another occasion for ritual. Similarly with the feasts and fasts of the years. In the Hebrew word and symbol the Hebrew found rest for his soul and this, too, he passed on to his offspring. But the inward peace was not met with outward peace. The Jew soon found himself in exile. (c 600 B.C.)

During the exile the written Torah, soon to be regarded as the divine will of God, arose. First recorded incidence of a code's use is in the Josianic reform of 621 B.C.[20] This was followed up by Ezra's promulgation of the law in 480 B.C. and finally in the closing of the canon in 90 A.D. The Mishnah (rabbinic doctrine) was in turn supplemented by the Talmud which interprets it. Sherrill writes of this evolution,[21]

> When Torah was thus increasingly reverenced, when it was regarded as person, existing before the world and immutable, Torah had become the supreme value in Jewish eyes. It was revelation, but revelation personified. Two duties flow from this conception; Torah must be known and Torah must be obeyed. Here then is the content of the education.

Torah likewise symbolized a provision against the Hebrew losing his identity in becoming like those with whom he was exiled. The same Torah later prevented a complete overthrow by Hellenism.[22]

The priestly-prophetic conflict carried into the exile[23] came out in the form of two doctrines: the saved remnant leading to a priestly

---

20 Sherrill, op.cit.; p. 31, l 24ff
21 Ibid., p. 37, l. 22ff
22 Ibid., p. 37, l. 33ff
23 Ibid., p. 39, l. 33ff

utopia (Ezekiel) and the saving remnant leading to redemption (Isaiah).[24] The former was Judaism's choice,[25] the latter that of Jesus. The returnees from the exile were soon subjected to the pressures of Hellenism. On the one hand some gave in. Others violently objected in the parties of scribes, Hasmoneans and Hassidim. A third group held a mid-way position. To them only the Torah bound. These pharisees, however, carried on the conflict of priest and prophet. They came in time to typify Judaism. The canon was extended by the pharisees to include traditions. Strict measures were taken to prevent foreign influences in canon, and education on this basis flowed out of the temple, synagogue, family and school.[26]

In the later period, the Hebrew modes of service were public services, school and home. The temple, until it was destroyed in 70 A. D., carried on public and private services. The synagogue, which may have come out of Babylonia, was more a teaching institution. It housed the synagogue school and based services on scripture exposition rather than sacrifice,[27] The home used considerable ritual, all with religious significance. By four years of age children began to memorize parts of the Torah.[28] By age thirteen, children were legally responsible and were expected to know the Torah thoroughly. In 70 A.D. , the council of the Jews, (the Sanhedrin), and the temple were destroyed. The pharisees dropped out of history at this point also. Christianity had been flourishing for forty years and had borrowed no small amount from her Hebrew heritage,in

---

24 Sherrill, op.cit. p. 40,l. 3
25 Ibid., p. 41-44
26 Ibid., p. 44, ll. 1-6
27 Ibid., p. 45, l. 7ff
28 Ibid., p. 48, l.12ff

modes of education if not theology and commandment.

It would appear that the early Jews were blessed with an endowment to serve man with theological insight. As we can also see Jewish religious education took place in a systematic fashion. The indoctrination began at an early age through the use of symbol articles in the home, of the nature of garment and body ornament. These were meant to arouse the curiosity of the young and remind all of certain religious meanings. Religious education was facilitated through the temple and synagogue and their corresponding schools as well. Even the apprentice under his tradesman or father was learning partly in religious education. Reinforcement of adult education should have been good through the acts of teaching on the part of adult and parent. The utility of these modes is largely restricted to these times in contrast to our own, due to our greater dependence on the printed word and picture in the place of symbol. Nevertheless, there were noticeable lacks in the system theologically and in spiritual reinforcement; for in their own time, Jesus, who Himself was likely a product of the Jewish religious education and environment, found in Judaism a legalism rather than a spiritual dependence, a fetter rather than a freedom,[29] and impersonalism rather than a personalism, a rule rather than a life, a breeding ground of pride rather than a fountainhead of humility, a prestige rather than a sacrifice, a concept of an earthly utopia rather than a spiritual kingdom subject to God. This Jesus sought to point up and remedy.

Jesus' simple teaching plan seems to have been to teach a group of

---

29 Sherrill, op.cit. p. 72, l.18ff

adults who were in turn to teach others. Judging by Jesus's silence on the subject of an organized presentation of teaching through a systematic use of social institutions and repetitions, it appears that his concern was primarily with the content of his teaching. This included God as sovereign in the manner of a king or father, God as personal, of God's triumph with life even at death, and a charter of liberty for all people through self-initiated servitude to one another's good.[30] Jesus did not implement a teaching scheme outside his own disciples and followers. His teaching approach was limited to his brief life, its contacts, a recognition of greater purposes beyond his own life and its earthly achievements, and dependence upon God that they would be carried out.

The early church, with its aggregations of families and a content of education already well established in Jesus' work, sought to develop a more elaborate system of presenting the church's truths.[31] The early church was an evangelizing church and so we see its first attention being directed toward adults in the proclamation of the gospel in preaching. Secondly , there was the aspect of didache, or the teaching and deeper indoctrination of the novice in faith. The gospel was an exhortation fo repent and to receive Jesus as Lord, the approach being substantiated by proofs from miracles and scripture. The second, the didache or teaching, was an interpretation of Hebrew scriptures, Jesus' life and teachings, the confession of faith, and the way of life.[32]

---

30 Sherrill, op.cit., pp. 98-136

31 Ibid., p.138, l.30ff

32 Ibid., pp. 142-153

The early Christians employed meetings, supper meetings, and family worship to extend fellowship and to study special writings. The main teaching content was in exposition of the word and in the Lord's Supper. It is also thought that Paul's writings, the gospels, and the apocalypses were studied during this period.[33] The family was regarded as in Judaism.[34] The home was considered to be "in the Lord" and teaching was implemented through conduct and instruction. Jewish ritual, however, gradually lost its place. In the community, wide recognition was given the prophetic utterance.[35] The Christian ethic also received much attention. The matter of establishing what was true,however, necessitated an accumulation of basic information about the passion, resurrection, and way of Jesus.[36]

As the church continued to grow from 100-600 A.D., in what may be termed the ancient church, the service was in two parts. The missa catechumenorum, for the catechumens, and the missa fidelium, for the faithful.[37]

About 550, the sermon was taken from the missa catechumenorum due to the absence of catechumens (adult novices). The one service was an integral part of the other, so that the change was easily incorporated. By this move,however, the element of teaching was almost entirely removed from the services. All the teaching during this period was not carried

---

33 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 153,l. 19ff
34 Ibid., p. 157, l. 27ff
35 Ibid., p. 166,l.22ff
36 Ibid., p. 178, l.3ff
37 Ibid., p. 183 ff.

on at worship meetings. A school known as the catechumenate was devised for adult converts. Sherill says of them:"Three pupposes are prominent. One was the disciplining of moral life, another was acquainting the catechumen with the Christian tradition; a third was the creation of a profound devotion to the Christian faith and way of life."[38]

The instruction of this school was of three kinds. At its earliest period (100-200A.D.), the more elementary took place in the worship service, and under the special tutelage more advanced writings of such men as the apologists were considered. Clement and Irenaeus formed philosophies of education at this time. During the third century, the catechumenate was divided into three stages of preparation toward baptism. The catechumens were divided into two main groups, the hearers and the competentes. The latter had passed through three stages and were subjected to more rigorous training and examination preparatory to baptism.[39]

During the fourth century (325-450) the catechumenate reached its peak. Examinations of the individuals' motives led to acceptance to the missa catechumenorum. From thence they went to the grade of 'hearer' and to 'competentes'. The instruction was terminated by baptism, after which they were instructed in the mysteries of the faith.

After 450 A.D. the catechumenate started to decline, as baptism became regarded as a priestly act rather than as one that required preliminary education.[40]

---

38 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 188 l. 4 ff
39 Ibid, p. 187, l. 17ff
40 Ibid, p. 196, l. 19

Sherrill states:

> Neither does there seem to have been any attempt to adapt the catechumenate to children, when it came to be expected that children should normally be baptized in infancy; for baptism was the goal toward which the catechumenate had moved and the church came to assume that when infants had been baptized the essential spiritual facts signified by baptism had taken place.[41]

From this point on the church began to foster the sacraments as the means of grace almost to the complete negligence of the spoken word. The period of catechumenal instruction began to shrink almost to the point of disappearing completely. Instead the catechumen was instructed in the four gospels, the creed and the Lord's Prayer by a liturgical act accomplished in one day.[42]

The common life demanded that certain moral standards be met, violation of which could lead to the delay of baptism.[43] A spiritual exercise was imposed upon the people to take care of sin. This latter also became part of the liturgy.[44] Pressure was directed against divorce. Remarriage was frowned upon. Marriage was regarded as secondary in importance to the single life.[45] We have little information regarding the education of children in the home during this time.

During the period of the ancient church there were a few schools of advanced religious education known as catechetical schools.[46] They resembled a college of arts dealing with such subjects as geometry, astronomy, philosophy, and ethics. They resembled a theological school inasmuch as scripture, Christian tradition, theology and the like were also taught.

---

41 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 196, l.33ff
42 Ibid., p. 197, l. 19
43 Ibid., p. 198, l. 5
44 Ibid., p. 198, l. 12
45 Ibid., p. 198, l. 26ff
46 Ibid., p. 201,

During this period there was much concern over the conception of the Deity.[47] The church played a prominent role:

> The church was the carrier of the tradition; and the church became the guarantor both of the tradition and of the scriptures. Thus the Christian 'believer's faith, in its first movement, was faith in the church which vouchsafed that 'this' teaching concerning Christ is true. The church in many respects replaced the Holy Spirit in the Christian's experience; enough so that in spite of tremendous experience of the Spirit in the primitive church, the items concerning the Spirit in the creeds look like an undeveloped vestige.[48]

The earlier belief in the spiritual equality of men gave way to a belief in a spiritual hierarchy. The Christian ethic became less a matter of how love might be expressed. It was more how the church's specific will spoken through the clergy might be achieved. The self assertion of the church was tempered by the alliance with the state. The authority of the church was encroaching upon the belief of the individual, but still there was room for the spirit to stir the hearts of believers. Education which endeavoured to be open at first gradually became more threatened by developing tradition. This closing of the doors of inquiry in turn led to an ignorance even on the part of the clergy. This age closes with a generally increasing ignorance making itself apparent. The empire is crumbling. Schools had virtually disappeared. Sherrill comments: "The resulting educational problem was bequeathed to the church of the middle ages. How shall a grossly ignorant people be taught by an increasingly ignorant clergy or laity when there are virtually no schools for clergy or laity in church or state."[49]

---

47 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 208, l. 3ff
48 Ibid., p. 208, l. 18
49 Ibid., p. 210, l. 12

The medieval period is initated with Pope Gregory the Great's (590-604) attempt to make all society a Christian society, politically as well as religiously. Sherrill writes:

> But for these eight centuries, the church presented itself to mankind, in varying degrees of thoroughness, as the controller of all human destiny here and hereafter. And this claim though certainly not unchallenged, was accepted in Europe as a basis upon which life must be ordered. This sovereignty of the church, asserted, exercised, and as yet unbroken, makes of these eight hundred years a unity as far as education is concerned. For the church undertook not only to control a man's acts as will be shown; but still more it undertook to control what he thought, The education was shaped by this assumption of authority, and colored by it at every step.[50]

This period witnesses in its later stages to the activity of the inquisition and like trials for heresy. The early concept of the church as a fellowship of believers was lost to the idea that the church was a society of priests who alone were competent to perform ecclesiastical acts and mediate between God and man. This however was not dependent upon theology, but rather canon law.[51] God was the Abyss, and austerely remote; the sacraments were regarded as the means of participation in the nature of the divine.[52] The doctrine of original sin was elaborated to explain the acts of baptism.[53] The most important education of the average person was found in the use of symbolism by the church. The formal education of schools was servant to the church and was related to the church's symbolism. Even so the church was primarily for worship rather than for mind and teaching.[54]

---

50 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 211, l. 29
51 Ibid., p. 215, l. 7f
52 Ibid., p. 217, l.18ff
53 Ibid., p. 220, l. 7ff
54 Ibid., p. 230, l. 35ff

In the thirteenth century the mendicant orders made the spoken word more familiar, but not dominant, due to the division within them and the hostility with which they were regarded.[55]

The ritual developed elaborately during the middle ages, so elaborately that in itself it needed interpretation.[56] As an educative device toward this end the church developed religious dramas about themes of the passion and resurrection, the nativity, the subjects of the Bible, and legends.[57] Symbolism in architecture was also used as a means of instruction.[58] (e.g. The classical church design in the shape of a horizontal cross.)

Common behaviour and motivation were governed by the church.[59] The idea of the seven deadly sins and the seven virtues still maintained the idea of the two ways of the primitive church.[60] Chivalry was given emphasis. Popular lore was passed on that conveyed religious concepts.[61] Far from true these stories held out ugly consequences for wrong doing, great hopes for good.[62] Christianity became an expectation of the miraculous.

The home life was largely a reflection of the communal life. Notwithstanding the outward piety of the time, wives were frequently ill treated, divorces were permitted, and the peasant was mistreated. The peasant family education was no better than his position. The theology of baptism in itself seemed to obviate the necessity to teach children to be Christians, since the rendering had already been achieved in a sacramental act.[63] Occasionally

---

55 Sherrill, op.cit. p. 231, l. 17ff
56 Ibid., p. 231, l. 32ff
57 Ibid., p.235, l. 27ff
58 Ibid., p.237, l. 18ff
59 Ibid., p.239, l. 10ff
60 Ibid., p. 239, l.22ff
61 Ibid., p. 240, l.10ff
62 Ibid., p. 242, l. 3ff
63 Ibid., p. 243, l. 19

the church took steps toward the education of children in the understanding of scripture and baptism. During the seventh to the tenth centuries parents were expected to teach their children the meaning of the creed and the Lord's prayer. In the thirteenth century there was a revived interest in religious education parallel to the increasing general interest in education. Regarding confession there was also a revived interest, requiring members to appear for the same at least annually. A variety of forms of instruction in simple topics such as the commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the love of God and the Christian ethic began to arise. Eventually it became apparent that the absolute reign of the doctrine of the sacraments must come to an end.[64]

Schools of the middle ages sought to plumb the symbols to establish the reality upon which they were based, leading to the autonomy of the individual mind. Formal education during these times was primarily to further equip someone already involved in church work.[65]

During the three hundred years before Charlemagne education was at its lowest ebb. Clergy education was scanty, but not entirely overlooked. Benedictine monasteries exacted a reading period in their rule. Younger clerics, by order, of the council of Toledo in 633, were to sit under a cleric of higher rank.[66]

Charlemagne, in 782, along with Alcuin, instituted a revival of learning. Courses were laid on for clergy and schools opened for children of

---

64 Sherrill, op .cit., p. 246, l. 31ff
65 Ibid., p. 249, l. 28ff
66 Ibid., p. 250, l. 19ff

the faithful.[67] Alcuin invigorated the monastic school.[68]

When Charlemagne's empire began to disintegrate about 850, many of the educational gains were lost. Ravages led to learning falling into neglect and low esteem. The year, 859, however, found the Synod of Langres asking that scholae publicae be opened for secular and religious schooling. Alfred of Britain set out to revive religious learning in 878. During the tenth century European life was very unstable and schooling was more a pretense than an actuality. From 1,000 to 1150 the intellectual climate was being prepared for a new awakening.[69] Feudal society began to change. The crusades led to contact with cultures that were superior in some aspects. Moral earnestness began to find a new place in monastic life and thence to the lay life. France saw a revival of interest in classical studies. Schooling was divided into the sacred and the human.[70] Universities began to arise to supplement the monastic and cathedral schools. In the thirteenth century, the place of universities in clerical studies was established in the conflict between the medicant orders and the university arts departments.[71] This resulted in a concession to recognize the contribution of the universities in education, but did not constitute a requirement that clergymen must have university training. The old idea of learning by serving continued widely. Universities in their training, however, required a degree in arts prior to admittance to theology degrees. It was not necessary that the arts student study theology. It is interesting, in the interests of

---

67 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 251, l. 27ff
68 Ibid., p. 253, l. 31ff
69 Ibid., p. 256, l.25ff
70 Ibid., p.257, l.25
71 Ibid., p.262, l.19ff

Christian education, to note that despite the fact that universities were established by the clergy no foundation work was required in religion.[72] From the outset a distinction was drawn between preparation for the church and other university training. One was training for the service of the church, the other for learning, and a distinction was drawn. A new zeal for logic also set in at this time, in an attempt to go beyond the symbol, and its forward movement was accentuated by the influence of Aristotelian thinking which found realism in things rather than symbols.[73]

During the middle ages there arose a new authority to which to refer, namely that of philosophy. Under the spearheading of John Scotus Erigena this became so. At the time of introduction it was in contrast to church authority, but Erigena employed it as neither secondary to scripture nor the fathers or councils.[74]

The new group of scholars thus begun were known as the scholastics. Later, they became embroiled over the matter of the nature of universals.[75] The grip of earthly authority was broken in the wake of their quest and the idea itself. The second period of scholasticism entered in with Abelard and the revival of Aristotelian thought.[76] This period extended from 1200 to 1400. The reconciliation of reason and authority was temporarily effected by Thomas Aquinas. He drew distinctions where reason was competent to enter, and where faith was the guiding principle.[77] Scotus and Ock-

---

72 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 265, l. 22 ff
73 Ibid., p. 266, l. 20 ff
74 Ibid., p. 271, l. 4 ff
75 Ibid., p. 272, l. 22 ff
76 Ibid., p. 274, l. 18 ff
77 Ibid., p. 275, l. 3 ff

ham brought about the discrediting of the suggestion that reason was an authority in itself on the basis of questioning its proving anything.[78]

The church had proven itself morally unworthy to run society; reason could not be looked to as establishing final proof. The next turn therefore to personally apprehend reality was to mysticism.[80] In many cases the mystics were scholastics though the scholastics were not necessarily mystics. This movement became strong in the fourteenth century. In the meantime the authority of the church was under question. Mysticism advocated a setting aside of the symbols and a form of crashing through the restraints of conventional thought to reality. The end was participation in the divine spirit. This school was characterized by Thomas à Kempis, Eckhart, Erasmus and Wyclif.

In the fifteenth century the storm broke. The renaissance set in and with it the reformation of the church of Christ. The renaissance and reformation led to great upheavals educationally and religiously. The church lost its place, as central authority was gradually unsurped by scientific method and reason. Nationalism developed quickly in a split up empire.[81] The individual was given a new value.

At the same time, there was an increased interest in education both regarding the revelatory side of life and the objectively perceivable. Classic studies of the humanities were revived and a new interest taken in the evaluation of the church's teachings. In the church a new emphasis

---

78 Sherrill, op.cit., p. 275, l. 24ff
79 Ibid., p. 277, l. 18ff
80 Ibid., p. 284, l. 9ff

was laid upon scriptural authority[82] and the centrality of God as sovereign in a personally reconciling relationship. This led to a decreased emphasis on the sacraments and an increased stress on the individual's knowledge of scripture and approaching him in reason. His response was to be phrased in feelings physically taken out to their logical implications to reality. The new individuality in the church necessitated universal Christian education. The Bible was translated into the language of the people and put into their hands to read. Preaching centered on Bible and doctrine. To cope with the situation of new thought, new catechisms had to be devised.[83] Among the outstanding of these are: Luther's Small Catechism, the Heidelburg Catechism, and the Westminster Catechism. Teaching was stressed in the family using these articles as a basis. Christian Schools were established in Protestant regions for all the youth of the community. Expecially in Lutheranism and Calvinism was such true. Luther proposed vernacular schools for boys and girls; Latin secondary schools to prepare clergy, and universities. Calvin proposed elementary vernacular education for all. Calvinist secondary schools exhibited a combination of humanistic and religious training. Similar developements took place in Scotland under John Knox's guidance.[84]

These ideas prevailed until the latter part of the eighteenth century, by which time the original impetus of the reformation had hardened into pietism or had been rendered impotent by rationalism. The eighteenth

---

82 J.D. Smart, The Teaching Ministry of the Church., p. 47, l. 18 ff
83 Ibid., p. 48, l. 7 ff
84 Ibid., p. 47, l. 32 ff

century, however, witnessed an evangelical revival that was to have far-reaching effects. Education was required to follow upon the heels of the evangelist's exhortations.

During this same period in America (1620-1787) settlements arose bringing with them many of the reformation principles. These had to be shaped according to the new situation, but by and large they were the same. The Bible was the chief teaching source and the sermon the chief means. Family education carried on industriously. Formal education reflected Calvin's thought. In the south the private school under family control was prevalent. In the middle colonies it was a church school; in New England a community school. Universities, several with religious sponsorship in their foundation, taught religious education among their courses.[85]

In 1780, in Glouchester, England something occurred that has continued to markedly affect Christian education ever since.[86] Robert Raikes started a school for illiterate children to be operated on Sunday. The main subjects were to be reading, writing, and arithmetic, but Bible lessons were also to be included . Since there was no schooling for children of the low income families this movement rapidly spread. In Scotland its efforts were confined to religious education, the other types of education already being provided for. The leaders of the movement were primarily lay folk and it seemed to reflect an attempt on the part of the common man to rise to a position of equal footing with the aristocrat. At the particular time it smacked

---

85 Smart, op.cit., p. 49, l. 4 ff
86 Ibid., p. 49, l. 4 ff

of rebellion, so that both the clergy and the aristocracy raised opposition to it. The movement continued, however, and in the process developed a distinct anti-clerical attitude.

Two of the great evangelists of the time, John Wesley and George Whitfield, also shared the distinction of being opposed by the clergy and aristocracy, so their evangelistic movement and the Sunday School movement soon began to enjoy each others' company. The educational movement was the answer to the evangelical requirement for consolidation. The association of the two, however, has left the Sunday School movement strongly based in an evangelical tradition, noticeable in its theological approach to children and in their hymns.[87]

Very early, Sunday School changed from being a school for illiterate children of non-Christian parents, to a school of religious instruction for members of families within and outside the church.[88] It took this form in Scotland, on the European mainland and in North America. About the time of its introduction in North America, a sharp line was being drawn between church and state and especially in the area of public education, which was becoming secularized.[89] The evangelical churches in America also adopted Sunday Schools early and there was similar clerical opposition to that experienced in England. The outcome was that the American Sunday School Union founded in 1824 would allow no clergymen to sit on its boards and local leadership was entirely laymen.[90] A pattern for Sunday School sessions developed that soon was to become standard and

---

87 Smart, op.cit., p. 50 l. 4
88 Ibid., p. 50, l. 22
89 Ibid., p. 50, l. 27
90 Ibid., p. 51, l. 1ff

largely persists even to this time.

The Sunday school movement did not present all the required answers to the religious education problem. In 1847, Horace Bushnell[91] sought to turn the Christian education of young people over to the family. His famous book, Christian Nuture,, centred on family education with the theme that the child should be so raised as to never know being other than Christian. His was an educative rather than evangelistic philosophy. His theory was that through parental influence a child's character development is most affected. By suitable influence, therefore, the child could have Christianity conditioned right into his or her character.

Bushnell's plan failed to receive much widespread attention, however, and in the meantime another program was being established to meet the shortcomings posed in the Sunday school scheme. This was the formation of parochial schools under the auspices of the Presbyterian church. This too, however, was abandoned as inadequate in 1870.

Meanwhile several developments were taking place. Evangelism was becoming fundamentalism and Sunday school Bible interpretation was largely literalistic. An effort was made to train lay leaders after the example of the normal school for teachers. The Sunday school movement was meeting in district and world conventions. A curriculum known as the uniform lesson system was evolved.[92] Young people's groups, more or less supplementary to the Sunday School began to develope. In the theological realm the movement was away from fundamentalism under the influence of such leaders as Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Hegel, Coleridge, Maurice and

---

91 Smart, op.cit., p. 52,l. 7
92 Ibid., p. 54, l. 29ff

Emerson.[93] Many church people were finding great value in the historical criticism of the Old and New Testaments and movement was away from literalism. Education was beginning to assert that new factors were necessary for the adequate teaching of children as far as curriculum and grouping were considered.

The outcome of this group of new influences in the face of the continuance of the old was the formation of a new society of persons interested in religious education. In 1903, the Religious Education Association was formed. Foremost among its considerations was an interest in the introduction of more intelligent methods of Bible study in church school. The religious education movement was made up of a people of highly variant theologies and assumed no stand in particular on the matter. The movement was soon regarded as the antithesis of the older Sunday school movement and its idea of graded lessons met with great suspicion. Consequently this association came to be categorically related with the liberal theological party. The result was that religious interest was largely divided into two camps. Criticism could be laid charge to them both, but something between the extremes of the two parties was to be desired and had as yet to emerge. The two streams of thought have continued in one sense apart from one another and yet in another mutually affecting one another.[94] James D. Smart, speculates that a third, possibly remedial, force has entered the fray in the force of the new theological emphasis which has been making its appearance since the world wars of the twentieth century.[95]

---

93 Smart, op.cit., p. 55, l.9ff
94 Ibid., p. 62, l.3ff
95 Ibid., p. 62, l.20ff. vide infra pp. 84ff.

Part of this has been in a position to define its distinction from other faiths. Sherrill points out our twentieth century period as one of re-orientation and experiments. He postulates that the impetus for this re-evaluation has been the increasing secularization of schools requiring more efficient religious training in churches, the upset in optimistic thought caused by the two world wars, and the developments of psychology and pedogogy. Christianity has realized that she must evolve a satisfactory philosophy of education and curriculum to express it. Steps have been taken in the formation of the Religious Education Association of 1903, and the merger of the International Sunday School Association[96] and the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations, to form The International Council of Religious Education in 1922. Professionalization has also been an outcome of this new emphasis. Some universities have religious education departments. Denominations have training schools. Research is going on continuously. It is now a recognized life vocation. There has been a shaky liaison between state and church on the matter of weekday education, the schools tending toward secularization. There are vacation schools, Sunday Schools, graded church schools and various young people's organizations. The situation is largely in a state of flux, but showing some excellent signs of settling. On the one hand we witness the antipathies between secular education and religious encroachment. Also the range of antipathies between various church education schemes and the battle in religious education, between the lay and clerical views although the

---

96 Smart, op.cit., p. 56, l. 27

latter has largely decreased in fervor. On the other hand we witness increased activity in respect to the study of the problem, the greater willingness of various groups to approach one another in understanding and outstanding contributions being made by the rapidly rising group of experts in the field.

CHAPTER III

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND THE SCHOOL

> Theoretically the Christian faith ought to affect the teaching of art, science, history, mathematics, but just how this can be done is another matter.[1]

The foregoing statement poses an interesting question in this twentieth century faced with the question of what to do about the moral education of young people.[2] Likewise, what to do about the moral education of a world in possession of nuclear weapons, in which immorality and irresponsibility are the forces that can turn them to destruction. It poses an interesting question in the light of a multitude of differing legislations in respect to religious education in public schools. It involves the controversies of the different denominations on the subject of their attitudes to community public education. It involves the parents' rights in respect to their choice in the education of their children.[3] It involves distinguishing between non-sectarian religious education, non-denominational Christian education and secular education.[4] Ir raises the question from secular ranks as to the necessity of religious education to build lasting morals. It raises the question of whether secularism and other non-theistically centred philosophies have the right to be classified as separate from religion, or if they are not religions in themselves inas-

---

1 Religious Book Club Bulletin, Vol. XXX, No. 8, p. 4. A Comment on a review of, An Approach to Christian Education, Davies

2 C. Henry, "Christian Responsibility In Education", Christianity Today, Vol. 1, No.17,(May 27,1957) p. 11

3 V. T. Thayer, Religion in Public Schools, pp. ix, 30 35ff, 90ff

4 Ibid., p. ix, 1. 20

much as they constitute a way of life, and set up ultimate values toward which to strive. It raises the question of whether religious education should be a generalized education by the state authorities, or if it is strictly the realm of the church, concerned as each group is about its own self-perpetuation, to teach in these fields. The question arises as to who shall finance separate school plans. Shall members of denominations be privileged to withdraw support from state education projects in favor of church education projects? Shall all people support state projects, and if Christian education projects arise religious groups be required to finance them separately to avoid diverting certain taxpayers funds away from the public system? The elements involved in practically every place we review these questions are: the non-Christian religious groups and the Christian churches, (the latter divide into those that believe in the right of the state to sponsor general education apart from a direct religious authority, and Christian churches that believe themselves to be superior to the state in education), the existing legislation and practice in any given area, the opinion of the people at a particular time,and what is just in the eyes of a living, judging, and sovereign God.

Four legal possibilities exist in the relations of church and state: the church and state may act independently in their respective temporal and spiritual functions(distinctions may be drawn as to what is spiritual and what is temporal, and these legally designated),the church and state may cooperate as equals in the combined administration of spiritual and tempor-or matters; the church may reign supreme with the state a department of it;

the state may reign supreme with the church a department of state. Accordingly, a different emphasis in religious education can be anticipated in each. Where the state is supreme religious education is merely a matter of what state authority decides to institute. It may not necessarily be Christian, or even theistic at all. For example, in Russia communist doctrine is taught. On the other hand, under a similar state authority, there may be statewide religious education instituted through the public school system, in consultation with a state religious philosophy, or the designated state church's scholars, Such a system would appear to operate in Great Britain, constitutionally a Christian state, with the Church of England the established church.[5]

Where government is a function of the people, and where the functions of the church and the state are separate, where all religious groups are recognized as equals in status, and where no previous arrangement has been made to accommodate to a possible overlap in these fields, there is the greatest opportunity for involvement. The final appeal then is to the feeling of the people. This may change from time to time according to changes in dominance among religious philosophical outlooks. Consequently it might play treason to the original principles under which a nation may have been constituted. The possibility arouses great feeling. Under this system, because of its separate designation, the state tends to be regarded as the antithesis of religion. Encroachments of one group upon the other are very easily suspected. The government tries to separate itself from church involvement and finds itself branded as the supporter of secular

---

5 S. Leeson, Christian Educ., p. 148, l. 6ff, p. 222f, p. 239ff, p.152 l.4ff

religion. Majority groups naturally enjoy the political influence accorded numbers, and justice becomes suspect in dealing fairly with all groups involved. Because the state is separate from the function of the church, she cannot educate religiously. Therefore, combined religious and other general education calls for the creation of parochial institutions by the churches, or the enlistment of an army of religious teachers for adequate released time programs. Because of inadequate organization and insufficient numbers of teachers in view of the number of programs required to meet the satisfaction of all the religions represented by an average community, either all non-Romans are sometimes not too satisfactorily grouped together as protestants, or certain churches refrain from the field of public education altogether. Consequently, in many communities only the Roman church and some of the larger protestant communions, or a combined protestant group, present religious education through the public system. In the former arrangement, the school is accused of sectional favoritism toward the particular churches presenting religious educational programs. Where there is combined protestant education it is conceivable that one religious group's influence will be greater than another. Resentment suggesting sectional favoritism between protestants may then crop up, because some parents dislike the slightest taint of another church's concepts. The problem approaches a crisis in this day when the separation of church and state is maintained and education is tending to be interpreted as both a temporal and spiritual-moral function.[6] Here the

---

6 Religion in Public Education. V.T. Thayer p. 91, l. 28

problem passes from one of community opinion to one that affects the educational and church theorists. If it can be agreed that education is a temporal and spiritual-moral function combined, the question is reopened as to who should have authority in education. One can rationalize along conservative lines to say that the church should look after spiritual education and the state temporal education. In actual practice, though, if the previous premise regarding the nature of education be true, the two schemes of education need to be integrated. Otherwise we are fostering an illusion regarding the complete separation of the religious and the practical. This fact should be realized by both the educationalist and the churchman. It is the great inconsistency in the possibility of the real separation of the church and the state.

It is in just such a situation-that of separation of the church and the state, the granting of equal rights to all religious groups, and no established church that the Christian church finds itself in North America. For contrary to the illusion created by the number of Christian groups, our country is not officially Christian in the full sense of the word, either by legislation or by the common desire of the people. Our country is not primarily Christian, but tolerant. Legislation may have been inaugurated by nominal Christians of one leaning or another, but the legislation itself bears no distinctive provisions that indicates that our state endorses the Christian philosophy especially. Our legislation simply provides for the practice of religion. It is in the face of this kind of a situation that our Christian education plans must be laid.

Realizing the scope and involvement of Christian education in the

public school we may justifiably ask, "What shall we do about it?" Many people are of the opinion that a general course of instruction in Christian education should be presented in school as a simple matter of course. They assume that our country is Christian and that their suggestion follows logically. This brings up an important question. How much right has anyone to advocate that the schools institute Christian education on our assumption that our country is Christian through the practice of nominal affiliation. Should Canada be called Christian and be expected to perpetuate a Christian heritage? A close analysis would probably indicate that our country is not Christian, but rather Christian humanist or thoroughgoing humanist. Our faith is not so much that one is saved by accepting Jesus as an express revelation of God or as God himself. We are more inclined to follow the practice of faith as Jesus did and find God the Father as our Savior. For a great number today Christ is a man and not the revelation or embodiment of God. Unfortunately we often go further in our humanism to the point that God is no longer our sovereign who uses us, but one whom we envision as our personal genie, and we labor under the illusion of thinking that we use him. Those who would suggest a general course in Christian education think that they would be regarded as doing their communities a favor. They think that they would be helping to provide it with something that its people really want. They also think that it can be initiated with very little effort or involvement. In view of the fact that subconsciously we are highly conditioned to tolerance, rather than Christian-

ity, to the tradition of the separation of the church and school, that denominationalism leads to problems in actual practice, the institution of religious education in schools is far from easy. Furthermore these same people probably find that the ones that they think they would be doing a favor might be their strongest opposition. There is a strong likelihood that the majority of the people of the very boards and congregations of protestant churches prefer to have religious education kept outside of the public school. To put Christian education into the schools of Canada really would burden the public school system. The school is largely conditioned in a moralism and tolerance which abhors the high calling and complex supernaturalism of Christianity.

In England, the problem of Christian education in schools is being solved by a combined program of church and state to present a Christian curriculum to the public system. In North America, where there is no state church, state or provinces (education is a function of the provinces under the B.N.A. Act,[7] and of the individual states in U.S.A. under the constitution of the United States[8]) have devised several different answers. Released time programs (half an hour per day or the equivalent in hours per week), can be set aside in the school curriculum for religious education, on or off the school premises. Proper application must be made before the opening of the school term, those who are to be teachers designated, and attendance voluntary.[9] Then, too, separate church or parochial schools may be formed. Finally, some provinces or states make provision for the separate school supporter to pay his

---

7 R. M. Dawson, "B.N.A. Act, 1867, sec. 93", Democratic Government in Canada, p. 155

8 T. A. Bailey, "Amendments to the Constitution (U.S.A.), Article I" The American Pageant, p. 970

9 The School Act, R.S.A. 1955, sec. 391-93

school tax toward the upkeep of the separate school, rather than to the public school. In some states and provinces this privilege is not extended. Indeed it is often strongly opposed. In some areas religious education under the sponsorship of churches must be outside the school property and outside of school hours. The subject of religion is dealt with only as it normally arises in historical study. The question that finally arises in these considerations is "What shall the Christian church advocate as an ultimate attitude in regard to their relation to the democratic state?" Shall it try to use the existing legislation to its maximum advantage? Shall it put religious education into schools, where it may lead the way to great religious confusion among school children, suspicion and bad feeling between churches, and a subsequent further confusion of the people of the community in general? Shall it use its own provisions for Christian education and limit its opportunities for contact with those who are to be taught? Shall it advocate parochial schools with all their varieties of standards and achievements in place of the public school, or as a supplement to it? Shall the church advocate exemption from public school taxes for those who support parochial schools? Shall the church advocate making the state Christian and then bargain on the basis of Christian legality for a Christian education curriculum in schools?

The most ideal situation from a Christian church's point of view would appear to prevail in a country that is constitutionally of the Christian religion, and prepared to offer a cooperative plan of religious

and general education to be presented in the normal course of education procedures. Christian concepts of human purpose could undergird courses and well organized and well related religious courses be presented. This of course assumes the possibility of harmonizing religious groups to agree upon a curriculum, or a group being set aside to evolve a state Christian philosophy. However, we do not want something that is dependent upon a mere mechanism such as authority or authoritative definition. We want something to contribute to the total integration of persons. We must take measures to see that our religion is spiritual and not merely legislative obedience. It must embrace the individual's personal experience of the living reality of God, and values in the here and now, as well as conformity. At the same time as we strive for the establishment of our country as Christian we must safeguard it against misconstrued overly legalistic, or totalitarian-ordered Christianity. Those groups which advocate such measures must be held in check. We cannot be so naive as to think that religious tyrants no longer exist, or that they are too scrupulous to operate in an atmosphere of true freedom. When we treat with the prospect of educating in public schools, we must remember that we treat with the basic principle of the relation between the church and state, not only of any one particular denomination, but all denominations and religions. We are not only teaching a philosophy of God by words, but by the very act of teaching in schools we are preaching in a manner that is often more far-reaching than words on the subject of church and state. Nevertheless, such a state philosophy situation does not exist, and though to move toward it may be a worthy goal, it is still a long

way from being realized. Furthermore, there are immediate Christian education problems calling for expedient measures within the provisions of existing legislation. We have a generation of young people to educate to the best of our ability. We have loyalties to continue to encourage to Christianity and the church. We have the threat of a highly organized Roman Catholic school system to meet which is making significant use of existing legislation. The question we must answer is whether or not we can make significant use of the established legislative opportunities at our disposal? Are the opportunities afforded significant enough to warrant entrance into the released time field, or are we better off to carry on our program outside the school, avoid confusing children, hard feelings, some very difficult organization labor, and some embarrassment over the present disorganization of our educational approach.

Possibly the strongest recommendation for public school education is the results that seem to be gained by the Roman Catholic Church from the same. There is little doubt about the convenience of the nearly all-inclusive gathering together of children in the schools, and the opportunity thus provided for contact with children otherwise uncontacted. It is also an excellent supplement to other church school education. It should at the very least provide twice as much time for teaching and inculcate a greater degree of loyalty to the church. On the other hand it plunges the child into an atmosphere of strongly represented religious differences, pits one religious group suspiciously against another, is not necessarily integrated to the general teaching, and frequently lacks consistent follow

through. A restatement of the question which the church must confront in this regard, is whether or not she best performs her task in being a transforming and integrating power apart from the community. Should she institute her own program of education apart from community sponsored education, or should she promote her philosophy to be accepted as the community philosophy, and work with the community in the processes of education? This leads to the question of whether our Christian philosophy can be the community philosophy in our time? For the church to reject the possibility of becoming the community philosophy is to sentence herself to being alien to the prevailing philosophy and education in the world in which she exists, and to aspire to sponsoring education herself. To accept the possibility of becoming the community philosophy is to accept the huge task of converting the entire community and the community processes to Christianity or Christian humanism. Can this be expected in the face of a community that is negative to such thinking as shown by her indifference to the church and her cherished disregard for the real living of religious principles.

Since different groups take differing points of view, agreement on a generalized community Christian philosophy is a near impossibility. If making people Christian can be reduced to education, or to transformation through education in conjunction with what might be called inoffensive general education, then, ideally, Christian education should be implemented through general community education. From a point of view of education it would seem that we can institute more Christian thought through a nonconflicting situation, such as would exist where Christian

and community philosophies were one. This would imply that Christian education should come through legislative enactment.

When all things are considered, however, establishing religious values and appreciation is a delicate combination of both herding and shepherding. The word herding for purposes of this reference might be interpreted as organization, discipline or legislative arrangement. The term shepherding might be understood to mean leading people to personal realization. The latter is hardly a simple matter of externals. Consequently, there is merit to be found, both in alliance with state planning through legislation, and institutions working separately from it. There is also the desireable feature of one acting as a stimulus to the other. From these conclusions it would appear that our approach to the church and state in education must be basically twofold. One, we must work toward a solid, broad, Christian philosophy to undergird education. Two, we must work independently as well, so as not to grow overcontent with the mere enactment of a state Christian education provision through schools. In view of the fact that people never will share exactly the same religious views at once, we can never expect total agreement to a particular approach. Yet, since all sound religion has some motivation in common, there are surely some broad thoughts which we can justifiably and harmoniously, work into a statewide acceptable view. To this end we must strive. On the other hand, the most important contributions made through Christian education programs of the past have been instituted outside the state institutions. We dare not lose sight of the extremely important place that the church plays as the nucleus of Christian education activities.

Our appraoch to state education must be cautions, however, not to assume naively that it is necessarily Godless. In Alberta, for instance, one of the overall responsibilities of teachers is to see that a child leamns a sense of reverence with a definite conviction of Deity, and a respect for His supreme handiwork, mankind.[10] There is also a prescribed course of Bible readings for daily use and the Lord's Prayer is to be repeated daily.[11] The latter are subject to being overruled by a district board of a school division if so desired, as are applications to teach religious education during the last half hour of school.[13] There is no provision, however, to see that each course as it affords opportunity shows the ultimate responsibility of every individual to genuinely serve God with the entirety of their being. Furthermore the conception of the Deity is not defined sufficiently to offer any guide as to the nature of Him that is to be reverenced. This is possibly a manifestation of an extreme form of liberalism that is so heartily attacked today in some theological quarters. However, we should also hold some distinctions in our minds between liberal religious education and liberal Christian education. In Alberta, the provincial education policy is liberal religion in statement. It is not Christian. By employment of the Lord's Prayer and Bible readings, it tends to be inclined toward being Christian. The problem of the local board being able to rule against these provisions further complicates this matter. This is a local power provision which is worthy

---

10 Alberta Department of Education, Senior High School Curriculum Guide for Social Studies 10 and 20, p. 10. 1. 26
11 The School Act, Chapter 297 of the Revised Statues of Alberta, 1955 Queen's Printer Edm., Part XIII, Sec. 390 (I), p. 130
12 Ibid., 390 (2) p. 130, R.S.A. 1955 Ch. 297, S 390(2)
13 Ibid., 391 - 392 (With Amts to 1958)

of some review. It is hardly consistent to call an essential state education policy valid and then give local areas the power to reject them. Either this is necessary teaching for all, or it is not. Despite these criticisms there is an attention directed toward teachers recognizing an educational responsibility to cultivate an appreciation of spiritual values and life fulfillment in Alberta curricula. These areas of interest offer much promise for further development if we are interested.

In short, our attitude must be to continue our present practices of using church premises and released time programs, and parochial schools. We must also make every effort to widen the base of our approach through an improvement in state and church relationships. We must gather better, less partial impressions of the state provisions for religious education and provide needed representations to the governmental authorities to improve them.

CHAPTER IV

SOME CONTEMPORARY VIEWS ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Among notable contributors of theories related to religious and Christian education are James D. Smart, Lewis J. Sherrill, Horace Bushnell, Ernest Chave, V. T. Thayer, A. Victor Murray and Spencer Leeson. Their views offer several solutions to the problems of Christian education that occur in different situations. For the sake of perspective in considering them we should recall that our present legislative situation in North America calls for religious education to be sponsored by the church through the media of parochial schools, relaased time programs church premise programs and the home. The policies of England are determined by an agreed syllabus. Our references will be related to these phases and the underlying philosophy to Christian education.

Horace Bushnell dealt with the Christian education approach particularly as it can be effected through the home, inferring a rejection of the idea of the need of a conversion and implying that a child can be environmentally conditioned into Christianity in the home.[1] James D. Smart of the Presbyterian Church of United States,sees an immediate need for a well-integrated church and home program. He also sees the need for development of a group of Christian educators (i.e. general educators of well-established Christian understanding) to take part in the state pro-

---

1 H. Bushnell, Christian Nurture

gram of instruction. The contribution of Lewis J. Sherrill of the same church is not so much in new theory as in the compilation of a very useful and informative history of the rise of Christian education. His studies cover emphases in the home, through the church, and schools. Victor Murray and Spencer Leeson both represent English views in the light of their Christian education problem and legislation. Murray speaks of the need for greater concentration upon emotional education to counteract an overdeveloped intellectual emphasis in general education. Spencer Leeson preents an excellent overall view of the national provisions for Christian education in England. Nevin Harner presents a hopeful picture of making use of standing views toward fulfilling youths' adolescent needs. Ernest Chave and V. T. Thayer represent a couple of rebels with an almost complete departure from the framework of Christian theology.

In view of the fact that Horace Bushnell's influence in contemporary thinking is a waning or negligible influence it will suffice the purpose of this discussion to mention it. As Lewis J. Sherrill's history has been dealt with in detail in Chapter two it will not be a concern beyond a reference to it as a major contribution. A. Victor Murray and Spencer Leeson representing English views will be dealt with in sequence. They will not be treated in contrast, but as two facets of a rather similar approach. Their primary difference would appear to be in the fact that they deal with two different aspects of the overall subject. James D. Smart, Nevin C. Harner, Ernest Chave and V. T.Thayer, however, comprise a much different situation. These represent a spectrum of the significant

and often conflicting contemporary views in North America. As they present the crux of the North American situation, which is more unsettled than the English and closer related to this thesis, a major place will be reserved for their consideration at the conclusion of this chapter.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION VIEWS IN ENGLAND

In dealing with the Christian education problem in England, A. Victor Murray deals more with the underlying philosophy of understanding what Christian education is, and how it is needed. Murray directs his attention to some prevalent assumptions about Christian education, challenging the church to recognize that her underlying philosophical approach needs radical revamping. He accuses the education of the average Englishman of being lopsided, because of an intellectual education with which few have attempted to keep pace in emotional education. He indicates that the dilemma of Christian education begins to form in the concept that religion and education are separate entities.

> The phrase religious education is almost self contradictory, for it seems to join together two opposites which all experience has put asunder. It is held that education proceeds by enquiry, criticism and experiment; religion is a matter of faith, obedience, and tradition. Education concerns the intellect; the root of religion is feeling. Education has to do with the world here and now; religion has its vital interest in the unseen world of spirit. Education requires teaching; religion is caught not taught. Education is concerned with the slow amelioration of our earthly lot, whereas religion in one aspect represents the challenge to alter it here and now. Education is identified with the humanist outlook and the best "pagan" virtues; religion advocates sacrifice and discipline.
>
> These distinctions are apt to be misleading, for there is a sense in which whatever is postulated of education is equally true of a historical religion and vice versa.[2]

---

2 A. Victor Murray, Education Into Religion, p. 1

Murray exposes the fallacies involved in thinking religious education to be mere instruction in religious principle without elaboration and correlation with life experience. He holds that a decreasing importance should be attached to the part that the relative places of atmosphere, personalities of teachers and the church play in a Christian education program. Murray believes in leading a person by natural religious inclinations into religion. He believes in the reconciliation of religion with general knowledge (arts and sciences)with the retention of cardinal Christian points. He believes that religion is necessary to establish morals, that it is related to fundamental psychological needs, and that the emotions need to be educated by worship as the mind is by teachings. He believes in an historical view of the Bible. Though not endorsing the infallibility of the church, he regards a relationship here necessary.[3]

There is some possibility that Murray overestimates the narrowness which he attacks in considering of the fallacies of religious instruction, personality of teacher, and the institution. He outlines a fine approach to the Bible as a book, but is lacking somewhat in simplicity and spiritual emphasis for purposes of wide application among those of average education. He makes an impressive defence of the historical method of biblical interpretation. He is greatly concerned about the integration of our most generally accepted ideas of psychology with our approach to Christian education. He suggests that our approach should take advantage of a recognition of a natural intuitive sense of God and give its anonymity name and histor-

---

3 A. V. Murray, Op. cit., pp 92, 123, 179, 194

ical perspective.

> Nevertheless, for the natural man this experience is one of contact with a world that is anonymous. He does not know with what or with whom he has to do. This anonymous presence therefore needs to be given a name and the unseen world itself need to be "informed",to be given form. This happened in the beginning of history in folklore and mythology. The powers of nature were personified and familiarity drew the sting of their awfulness. But it has better come about through man's reflection on their own experiences, through the insight of persons particularly sensitive to spiritual qualities, such as Hebrew prophets and the prophets and poets of every age and country, through the pattern that gradually shows itself in the history of the race, and through the accumulated records of the experience of men in this sphere. Looked at from one side these have all been men's discoveries about the unseen world. From the other side they are God's revelation of Himself. In this sense therefore, there is not and never has been "religion without revelation". It is the same God who was there in the first nuclear fission whom we now believe to be "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." [4]

Murray cautions against limiting God by word or thought, doctrine, interpretation or institution.

> A moral difficulty in the case of historical religions is that they express themselves in words so fully that God is apt to become narrowed down to the compass of our own thought. Hence arises that familiarity in things of God which is the sin of idolatry, it is to worship that which our minds have made...
>
> An earlier generation valued knowledge mainly for its form: the present generation is apt to value it for its content. Yet the alternative is not an authoritarian creed, for the authoritarian may be just as much the victim of his own intellect as the modernist: he is apt to be concerned with propositions intellectually conceived, and he is looking for certainty.[5]

He is careful however, not to equate Christianity with natural religion in recognition that Christianity is historical.

---

4 A. V. Murray, op.cit., p. 93, l. 35
5 Ibid., p. 94, l. 21

> Christianity therefore contains much that is not present in natural religion. It is concerned with history, with human beings in fellowship with one another and with God Himself as these other factors reveal Him. It has a vision of human destiny and it impels towards action. It has, moreover, a standard of life in the person of Jesus Christ, and it is therefore present in the world not as a mere inevitable evolution from a primitive natural religion, but as a perpetual challenge to things as they are. It recognizes the existence of dark forces of sin in oneself and in the world, and it has a gospel of deliverance. Natural religion is essentially conservative. Christianity is essentially revolutionary, but insofar as it includes natural religion it has a conservative element within it.[6]

As Murray applies the adjective, natural, to Christianity he points out that it is only in the sense that Christianity is consistent with the true nature of man.

> Consequently the Christian gospel will be found to contain and not to contradict anything that is of the true nature of man, no matter how early or how late it has made its appearance. The humanist dilemma, for instance, 'thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece,' may represent quite unreal alternatives. The contradiction may be true at this or that stage in the progress of mankind, or of an individual, or in this or that situation, but it cannot be universally true in a world in which God has revealed Himself in many ways. But it is as we move forward that we see more and more content in the Gospel, more of what it really is, and John Robinson, the Pilgrim Father, proclaimed a truth that is at the very heart of Christianity when he declared, God has yet more light and truth to show forth from his word. The light and truth, however, is very often not something new, but something very old which hitherto has been thought to have been at variance with or irrelevant to the Gospel. We hold with Aristotle that the real nature of a thing is shown in its highest manifestation, and this need not be its original form at all.[7]

The recurrent theme of his analysis of the Christian education problem is the divorce in education between feeling and intellect.

---

6 A. V. Murray, op.cit., p. 96, l. 3ff
7 Ibid., p. 97 l. 28ff

> The truth is that education carries with it its own peculiar inherent difficulty which we cannot get rid of by any mere change in curriculum, or examinations, or system. Progress in education inevitably widens the gulf between thought and emotion and puts asunder that which God has joined together. We progress on the intellectual plane while standing still, or even receding, on the emotional.[8]

The solution he suggests is in pressing the intellect to its point of limitation where we use our feeling and intuition, and then pushing on in faith.[9] This he asserts requires a guard against looking upon intellect as an end in itself rather than a means to an end. Education of the emotions, he proposes, is a most important aspect of education into religion since religion by his hypothesis is primarily feeling.

In exposing the lack of soundness in morals unsupported by religion he points out that moral living constitutes an important aspect of religious living.[10] He is also careful to point out that Christianity is not just the maintaining of a standard conservativism, but a pressing toward the more ideal.

> Religion as a sanction is characteristic of primitive and unprogressive societies and of the conservative mind everywhere. It is the most deeply rooted of all the religious types and, as we seen, is invoked equally by dictators and by ordinary citizens. Religion as a challenge, however, is a peculiar product of Judaism and Christianity. Both these religions are concerned with the ideal and its achievement, and are not content with things as they are. They share with other religions an element of conservativism, but it is their deep concern with history and with events and above all it is their essentially incarnational ethics that are the sources of their challenge to human life.[11]

---

8 A.V.Murray, op.cit., p. 100, l.15ff, p. 107, l.7ff
9 Ibid., p. 108
10 Ibid., p. 119, l. 4ff
11 Ibid., p. 120, l.5ff

Murray considers the Christian community, its fallibilities, and its significance in ideals, evangelism, historical succession, fellowship and faith.[13] He suggests that worship at school should be compulsory as an essential in the education of the emotions.[14] In a concluding note he indicates that conversion has a necessary comrade in education.[15]

The approach of Leeson to the Christian education question is primarily that of the Church of England in reaction to the provisions of the Education Act of 1944 as it affects religious education in schools. Leeson deals with the meaning and purpose of education as derived from Christian philosophy and from Plato's thought on the order of purpose and method.[16] He also treats of the impossibility of citizenship as a goal. Leeson then deals with the historical retrospect of the inheritance of Christianity in education and makes a very able presentation of the intellectual tension existing between scientific optimism and Christian orthodoxy during the last hundred years. He asserts that the scales are swung slightly in favor of supernatural religion in the wake of the two world wars. He indicates that the English state education was born with the assumption of Christianity as a background, but that assumption has in part been subject to an influence to replace it with the assumption of theism or humanism. The context of religious education he indicates is the eternal destiny of man, man in the image of God, Jesus the revelation of God and Savior of men, and the equal value of all men in the sight of God. Leeson scores the lack of informed Christians in the average

---

12 A. V. Murray, op.cit., p. 179
13 Ibid., pp. 182, 186, l. 91ff
14 Ibid., pp. 210
15 Ibid., p. 225
16 Leeson, S., Christian Education, pp. 69, 71, 91

home.[17] He pays respect to the work of the Sunday School movement. He indicates the hope of a lessening of the antipathy between public school teachers and the church in respect to Christian education, especially school premise programs. He indicates the sympathy of the free church with the separation of state and church education, but the common concern of the established and free churches with the problem of secular humanism.[18] He indicates the opposition of Roman Catholicism to any consideration of state education as follows.

> Over against that and in every sense opposed to it is the profession of the Roman Catholic Church and an important section of the Church of England. The Roman Church is of course officially committed to an extreme and exclusive assertion that she alone possesses the truth, and is alone commissioned to teach it...
>
> and for them the agreed syllabus has no authority at all. To them the interdenominationalism of the agreed syllabus is simply another species of denominationalism sponsored by act of Parliament; and those who teach it, not necessarily themselves members of any church or even Christians are as it were, priests of another order, teaching a faith that has no authority whatever except that of the country or other council that prescribes it...[19]

Leeson points out the variations made in the provisions for schools of different categories.[20] He discusses the agreed syllabus that called upon the cooperation of the Anglicans, Free Churchmen, teachers, and school administrators as it was developed for implementation through the English Education Act of 1944. Leeson has considerable praise for the syllabus and a few reservations.[21] He reports that there is strong likelihood for the new syllabus to be smoothly implemented in the primary

---

17 S. Leeson, op.cit., p. 140, l. 2ff
18 Ibid., p. 148, l. 2ff
19 Ibid., p. 149, l. 6ff
20 Ibid., p. 152, l.38ff
21 Ibid., p. 154, l.18ff

and secondary schools. He points out that in voluntary and cathedral choir schools, religious education is already instituted according to their trust deeds,[22] and that the act should not markedly affect them. Nursery and technical schools he regards as new ventures, but offering admirable scope. He points out that in higher education there are no longer any religious colleges and there is no religion in colleges. Leeson makes mention of the possibilities of adult education, but presents no definite scheme.[23] He sees that the responsibility for education rests mainly with the home and that it should be assisted by the state church and school. The English Education Act of 1944 ratifies this point of view.[24] In answer to the question as to what part the state should take in Christian education, Leeson suggests that there should be no state syllabus, (rather an agreed syllabus), that the state should be fair to all religious groups and objectors, and that it should promote good religious training. He brings out the Archbishop of Canterbury's three points on this subject emphasizing[25] particularly his statement regarding the freedom not to teach the religious curriculum to be granted teachers so desiring.[26] Leeson sees the possibility of Britain carrying a constructive influence into the whole commonwealth. He feels that the Church of England in religious education should respect the views of the free churches, the ministry of education, and local educational authorities. He endorses the idea of accepting the provisions of the act; of

---

22 S. Leeson, op.cit., p. 152, l. 18ff
23 Ibid., p. 175ff
24 Ibid., p183, l. 3ff
25 Ibid. p. 192, l. 29ff
26 Ibid., p. 194, l.35ff

accepting the task of promoting religious and general education, and of having qualified teachers for both phases. He speaks of the need for denominational cooperation and the need to gain the confidence of the teachers. He challenges the church to become the spiritual and intellectual guide of today.

SOME NORTH AMERICAN VIEWS ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The school situation in England, as a reference to the Education Act of 1944 would show,[26] is more advantageous legally to the Christian Church than the corresponding situation in North America. With a prevalent emphasis on the separation of the church and the state, the matter of what happens to the school philosophies and in classes themselves is much more critical to the church here. The matter of secular humanism in England, though certainly not unnoticed, does not have the same teeth as in North America where the churches have no official voices in public school curricula. Meantime secular humanism here, would seem to have a freer access since it is frequently presented as educational philosophy and seldom recognized as a religion. Of the writers reviewed here Ernest Chave and V. T. Thayer point in the humanist direction; Nevin Harner and James D. Smart in the Christian. Although they may not necessarily represent the most influential single voices in present educational trends, happily they do tend to bring out some of the major issues.

---

26 S. Leeson, op.cit., p. 194

E. J. Chave sees a radical change in the world and with this change the necessity of Christianity to change.[27] He places his hope and faith in the developing "wisdom and idealism of humanity".[28] Chave takes a naturalistic approach to religion maintaining that it is more realistic.[29] It would seem to Chave that man has control of his idealism rather than God His control over surrendered man.[30] Chave is disappointed in the concept of a personal God.[31] He is disappointed in ideas held upon the Word of God. Outlining a failure of modern day religion Chave blames poor religious concepts on an educational system that fails to develop critical and comprehensive thinking. Chave feels that the present immediate threats to basic human values have precipitated a sense of need in man. He maintains that as the more pervasive and functional aspects of religion gain ascendancy, the theological, institutional, and historical elements take a secondary place.[32] Chave sets out to show what is functional in religion and how it takes advantage of the best in religion. He seeks to indicate how functionalism is a key to transcending sectionalism.[33] He seeks to present a functional church education curriculum and an idea of how functional religion can be employed in schools. To Chave the chief value of religion is that it serves man rather than God. One might term functional religion as psychological religion, insofar as it is interpreted from the point of view of human need in contrast to historical, theological and philosophical approaches to religion.[34]

---

27 E. J. Chave, A Functional Analysis of Religion, p. 1ff
28 Ibid., p. 3, l.27
29 Ibid., p. 6, l.17ff
30 Ibid., p. 8
31 Ibid., p.10, l. 5ff
32 Ibid., p.14, l. 8ff
33 Ibid., p.23, l. 7ff
34 Ibid., p. 17

Chave relates human religion to the following experiences:[35] sense of worth, social sensitivity, appreciation of the universe, discrimination in values, responsibility and accountability, cooperative fellowship, quest for truth and realization of values, integration of experiences into a working philosophy of life, appreciation of historical continuity, and participation in group celebrations. From a functional view, he feels that religion does not need to assume a theistic point of view.[36] Chave discusses, with illustrations, factors and situations which affect the development of social worth and social sensitivity. He does not say that religion develops from them, but rather that they are religious or maturing situations. In discussion of appreciation Chave asserts there are common ends in all forms of religion, and these ends are the maximum functioning of all human beings as growing, intelligent, discriminating persons. Chave insists upon the appreciation of things in more natural reference,[37] but he is inclined to oversimplify the intention of theistic religious appreciation in his attack upon it. He is further concerned about religion destroying discriminating thinking.[38] He emphasizes the importance of discriminating thinking, but questions the usefulness of Jesus' "way" because of the varied interpretations accorded it.[39] Chave associates discrimination with sacrifice, but laments the number who have failed to grasp the joy of social living (integrated through personal willingness to sacrifice of harmony) because of selfishness.[40] He laments the lack of largeness in people's thinking,[41] as he rips the fabric of largeness to shreds by reduc-

---

35 E.J. Chave, op.cit., p. 22
36 Ibid., p. 25, l.27
37 Ibid., p. 63, l.11ff, l.28ff
38 Ibid., p. 66, l.2ff
39 Ibid., p.66, l. 16ff
40 A Functional Analysis of Religion, E.J. Chave, p. 68 ff
41 Ibid., p. 69 ff

ing religion to a utilitarian man-serving instrument (a functional and technological instrument). In considering responsibility and accountability Chave asserts that they are essential to freedom, which is essential to spiritual growth. He laments that many do not become independent sooner. Chave shows a novel interpretation of atonement in which the end master is no longer the creator, but humanity.[42] He emphasizes the necessity for a growing sense of responsibility to meet our grants of privileges in twentieth century North America. He is optimistic about the evidence of the growth of such responsibility,[43] convinced that a criminal tendency is to be found only in a minority. Chave reacts unfavorably to the idea of sin, a fact which is interesting in the light of his other realism.[44] Nevertheless, he recognizes the need for discipline and relates the same to religious training.[45] Chave makes an interesting statement that a constant problem in trying to make responsibility and accountability attractive is that it is impossible to keep a balanced and just situation. He is a little narrow in his description of the religious interpretation of conscience and the jeopardy to which it is subjected by evangelism.[46] Chave sees as the value of fellowship - creative interaction, sustaining power and combined power. His criticism of the church as a fellowship group bears comment. He says it has not drawn as many people unto itself as it should and that its sectarian character and tendency to follow stereotyped practices are at fault. Yet often the

---

42 A. Functional Analysis of Religion, E.J. Chave, p. 74 ff
43 Ibid., p. 75, 1.30
44 Ibid., p. 75, 1.17ff
45 Ibid., p. 77, 1.10ff
46 Ibid., p. 80, 1.15ff

fact of variance to a point where there is no norm is its very undoing. In discussing college age fellowship, Chave comments upon the large measure of freedom demanded at this time. He implies disdain of talking of God, or good or evil, yet maintains a concern over lack of evidence of significant goals and a failure of vision or purpose to be stirred.[47] Chave feels that the enquiring mind with its capacity for discriminating appreciation is the chief organ of religious sensitivity.[48] He does not agree with those who would separate the spiritual ends of public school and church. He feels that natural religion would do away with the need to separate.[49] He rejects the idea of God because we are unable to express agreement around the meaning of our term.[50] He feels that personal integration is to be found in expanding creative interests.[51] Regarding history and celebrations Chave feels that the Bible must take a secondary place to the total available religious knowledge. It ought to be treated in historical study. He feels that history is a good background to preserve continuity in the whole setting of life, but he is not too specific. In religious celebrations he sees latent possibilities for spiritual insights, but that they require creative opportunity of participation.

Chave feels that too much obsolete machinery is being maintained in present day religion. He feels that the application of more psychology is a requisite.[52] The new approach he contends will not dwell on ancient thinking in theology and abstract speculations on prescientific concepts.

---

47 E. H. Chave, op.cit., p. 87, l.21ff
48 Ibid., p. 92, l.2ff
49 Ibid., p. 94, l.18-20
50 Ibid., p. 95, l.7ff
51 Ibid., p. 107, l.9ff
52 Ibid., p. 127, l.10ff

Man's gaze is away from the supernatural to the natural. He sees the need for social psychology and united thinking on social, political, economic, moral and religious matters.[53] He views a necessity for more religious history than that afforded in the Bible. He expects closer liasion between religionists and other leaders. He feels a need for broader education in seminaries, particularly in respect to educating into cooperative attitudes in preparation to work with others. He views the need for more illustrative methods. The substance of Chave's conclusion is that man is a growing creature and is best left to freedom from restriction in teaching about God; rather expose him to the gamut of education and educational experiences and let his growth take place. The goal of religion is to attain the fullest possibilities of personal-social living.[54] Chave adds an appendix to his book showing anarranged curriculum for religious education. He is somewhat averse to its use in public schools because of the implication that religion can be taught as something that is just tacked on.

In his book, Religion in Public Education, V. T. Thayer rejects the charge that the public school is Godless.[55] He traces the origin of the non-sectarian system. He cites the position of the separation of church and state and then observes that pressures are being brought to bear to reduce the emphasis upon the separation of religion and the state. In his estimate, contrary to the interpretation of others, the intent of the constitution is to separate religion and state absolutely. (The other thought is that the intent of the constitution was to embrace Christian philosophy, but to reject the connection with any particular denomination of the Christian

---

53 E. J. Chave, op.cit., p. 136, l. 5ff
54 Ibid., p. 144, l.1ff
55 V. T. Thayer, Religion in Public Education, p. 1

church.[56] However, during the period between World War One and World War Two, education tended to degenerate into technology and training. Now, in the wake of the second war and nuclear fission, there is more concern to place religious education back in the thinking of people. Consequently the churches are suggesting, with considerable support, trends in contrast to the de-idealizing of education during the inter war period. To this V.T.Thayer desires to answer. He suggests that the principle of the separation of church and state in the United States is being contravened. The people are being misled that morals must be grounded in religion. He believes that morals can be taught apart from religion and that the wisdom of teaching religion in schools is questionable in view of the complications that it involves among both children and adults.[57] He further suggests that the support of non-public schools is inadvisable on the grounds of their inefficiency due to ill-equipment and inefficient contact with the children. (e.g. enrollment figure percentages.[58]) As an appendix Thayer includes a curriculum for ages one to six, on ethics, in ethical culture schools. In his argument Thayer brings out that education is a function of the state as well as of the parent.[59]

The end result of following up the philosophies of Chave and Thayer would be the complete dissappearance of the church as we know it. There might be a some institution, but it would not be a Christian Church.

---

56 J. D. Smart, The Teaching Ministry of the Church, p. 202, l.20
57 V.T. Thayer, Religion in Public Education, p. 155, l.7ff
58 Ibid., p. 146, l.12ff
59 Ibid., p. 154, l.17ff

Nevin Harner's concepts offer a direct contrast to Chave and Thayer. His idea of religious education is positively rooted in a belief in a personal God. Two of his books outline his views on the subject: I Believe, (A Christian Faith for Youth), and Youth Work In The Church. In the first book Harner presents his belief in a personal God who is like Jesus Christ. This God, he explains, is referred to by Christians in terms of his activities in creation, Jesus of Nazareth, and his continuing presense with persons.[60] Harner goes on to comment that man is a creature who needs to be saved.[61] At this point he offers a direct contrast to Chave, asserting that man is a sinner.[62] A further testimony to Harner's belief in a personal God is offered in his devoting two chapters of I Believe to the subjects of God's Kingdom and Prayer.[63] Harner insists on the central importance of the Bible, regarding it as the Word of God.[64] To Harner the church is an essential institution to the Christian's life:"Yes, the Church, the body of Christ, is imperfect but the spirit within it is not imperfect. Compared to that spirit it is not as yet what it ought to be. Compared with other institutions, it is the best this world has ever seen."[65] Harner touches upon a subject unmentioned by Chave and Thayer--eternal life. Perhaps the comparison is unfair. Can we expect a God who is nothing more than humanity to present us with the hope of an eternal life? No more than perhaps the Baals of the Old Testament time could provide

---

60 N. C. Harner, I Believe, p. 36
61 Ibid., p. 107
62 Ibid., p. 45
63 Ibid., p. 86, ff, 118ff
64 Ibid., p. 51
65 Ibid., p. 73

power.[66]

In his book, Youth Work In The Church, Harner turns to a critical view of the Christian education approach, but not of the basic theological assumptions. He is happy enough to work within the framework of these, but would emphasize a more person centred rather than curriculum centred approach. His book outlines youth's attitude toward the church, pointing out the needs of youth for guidance in faith, self understanding, vocation selection, sex education and Christian fellowship. Harner is optimistic about young people. He points out their status as a minority portion of society. He cites the problems which they face in employment, home, sex relations and recreation. Nevertheless, he notes their idealism. He notes also their attendance at church, but does not overestimate the depth in their attitudes. Harner observes a more recent interest on the part of the church in youth. The two strategies Harner notices employed are tying youth to the church through emotional experiences and tying them by fulfilling definite needs of youth. He prefers the latter as the central emphasis. He considers the church as the primary medium for Christian education.

The proposals of James D. Smart likewise stand in sharp contrast to Chave and Thayer. Where Chave is disappointed in the concepts of a personal God, Smart is assertive. Where Chave would play down the place of the Bible Smart would emphasize its importance. Where Chave would dispense with the major emphasis upon theology and the church, Smart

---

66 I Kings 18:21-39

would give them central importance. Whilst Chave sees faith as something that interferes with critical thinking, J. Smart asserts that it is from this source that critical thinking gets its perspective. At one point there is agreement. Both agree that Jesus "Way" needs to be given attention. The approach of Chave, however, is to discard the reference as meaningless. Smart would recover the theology that should go behind it to recover its meaning. Perhaps the sharpest contrast is offered in comparing the goals sought by the two approaches. Chave seeks as a goal the fullest possiblities of personal social living with no fellowship with a personal living God. Smart would seek to establish a way for man to grasp a destiny in fellowship with a personal Eternal God.[67] Though both goals embrace persond fulfillment only the latter sets it upon an eternal basis. Thayer and Smart present two different thoughts in respect to the subject of morality, although not diametrically opposed ones. Thayer would dispense with attaching morals to a religious basis. Smart would dispense with a representation of morals as the ultimate goal of Christian education. Smart realizes at this point that Christians are dangerously close to creating a functional appreciation of Christian education themselves. The whole course of Smart's thesis is worthy of examination and to that subject we will now turn.

The central assumptions of Smart's thesis are twofold. First, Christian education needs a more penetrating view of its goal.[68] Secondly, it must have a deeper appreciation of the Christian theology, in the light

---

67 J. D. Smart, op. cit., p. 103, 1.5ff, p. 48, 1.19
68 Ibid., p. 106, 1. 36ff

of which alone, it is adequate to establish its true goal. Smart asserts that the church has of late suffered too much under the "suffocating fog of moralism,"

> Another factor in the situation which deserves mention is the prevalence of moralism through all types of church school. It takes a different form in a conservative school from what it does in a broadly liberal one, the former concentrating on individual morals and the latter most likely emphasizing the social aspects of one's duty, But both agree in regarding the conduct of the children as their main concern...[69]

and treated too long with impossible goal of character development:

> The definition of goal that has been heard most frequently for several generations, is "the making of Christian character," and among most educators there would be agreement that this is, on the whole, the most satisfactory formulation of their purpose.[70] Ask the average parent what he expects the church school to do for his children, and again you will hear the word "good";.[71] After all, what other way is there to Christianize the world than just to keep on making more and more people good Christians?[72]

Smart's contention is that the mistake of viewing these as the goals of Christian education have been responsible for the church's failure to keep its eye trained on the true goal. This he defines as discipleship to Jesus Christ. His vision of the goal to be sought is one that is incomplete without a faith in God: "The insistence upon faith alone is therefore an insistence merely that no one can be a Christian without knowing God as he is revealed in the New Testament."[73] In order to give a more complete picture of the dilemma of Christian education, Smart

---

69 S. D. Smart, op.cit., p. 77, l. 15ff
70 Ibid., p. 92, l. 12ff
71 Ibid., p. 92, l. 19ff
72 Ibid., p. 92, l. 35ff
73 Ibid., p. 91, l. 15ff

examines historically the teaching function of the ministry, the origin of the divorce between education and theology and the origin of the Sunday school movement. In this light he proceeds to a discussion of the present situation and a redefinition of the goal. He then discusses the relationship of the program, the Bible, the growth of persons the Christian home, and the public school to Christian Education.

Smart feels that the church must recover an estimate of the importance of teaching as a function of the ministry:

> Teaching belongs to the essence of the Church and a church that neglects this function of teaching has lost something that is indispensable to its nature as a church. It is a defective church it if is lacking at this point, just as a church in which the gospel ceases to be preached in its purity or a church in which the sacraments cease to be rightly administered is a defective church.[74]

> In quite another quarter the failure to recognize the necessity of the teaching function of the church has resulted in a misconception of the ministry. Very widely the task of the minister is conceived as primarily that of a preacher and pastor. If he carries any educational responsibility, that is something added which does not properly belong to his office.[75]

Smart feels that much of the cause for the present points of view is the result of the type of thinking reflected on this subject in the writing of C.H. Dodd on "Kerygma" and "Didache":

> Much harm has been done to a right understanding of the place of teaching in the church by the wide acceptance of the views of C.H. Dodd on kerygma and didache. (the original New Testament preaching and teaching) as enunciated in his Apostolic Preaching and Its Developements, publishing in 1936. The

---

74 J. D. Smart, op.cit., p. 11, l.11ff
75 Ibid., p. 12, l. 30ff

> New Testament writers he says draw a clear distinction between preaching and teaching...[76]
>
> In this as we have already seen Dodd is out of line with the entire Biblical tradition...[77]

Smart also takes issue with the idea of separating the fields of education and theology. He touches two extremes:

> The Christian educator has apparently assumed that his subject is educational rather than theological. [78]
>
> Again there is the attitude with which Paul Tillich in his dogmatics I (page 32), finds himself in agreement, which regards not only Christian education but all the practical departments of the theological curriculum as mere studies in practical techniques, and so essentially outside the scope of theology proper, nothing more than methodological addenda to the curriculum.

In contrast to these views Smart advocates, "the teaching of the Word requires a department of Christian education. [80] "It should be noted that Word means a lot more than Biblical ethics to Smart.

A lot of Biblical rigidity and the divorce between theology and the Christian education he traces to the prevailing influences at the time of the introduction of the Sunday School movement. The Sunday School movement early became wed to an evangelical movement that hardened later into fundamentalism. The opposition from all but the evangelical clergy led to a complete separation from any clerical leadership. A reaction to the Sunday school movement led to the formation of a very liberal religious education movement which, divorced nearly altogether from theology, became primarily an ethical emphasis. A contention between the two move-

---

76 J. D. Smart, op. cit. p. 21, l. 12 ff
77 Ibid., p. 22, l. 5f
78 Ibid., p. 12, l. 15ff
79 Ibid., p. 24, l. 15
80 Ibid., p. 40, l. 30

ments has continued, but, of recent, both have been indirectly instrumental in leading to a consideration of an adequate theology to supply both their needs. Smart accuses the Sunday Schools of having a rigidity of ideas and practices that betrays an insecurity caused by the educational divorce from the total context of the church's work and her theology. Furthermore he asserts that there is a confusion as to the church's real responsibility to education, the training of teachers, the preparation required to teach lessons, whether the goals of Christian education are ethical or theological, and the responsibility of the Christian home in the teaching process.

His redefinition of the goal of Christian education can be described in a word-- theological. Smart takes the church's faith in God out to its logical implications to find a direction in it. This he contrasts with the goals of character development, idealism, mechanical or legal formula for salvation. In shaping the program, Smart would point out the church as the focal point around which the educational program is to be built. This is above Bible centred or child centred programs. It will, he states require facing up to the real and ideal aspects of the church rather than just dwelling upon the latter. The whole church will have to see its responsibility to educate. The curriculum will have to make room for a central emphasis on the Bible, then worship, fellowship, church history and training to be the church. Smart is far from unconscious of the problems of effectively employing the Bible. He sees a generation of Christians who know very little about their Bibles, and traces the origin of the conflict between the fundamental and critical approaches to the Bible hist-

orically. He outlines the problem areas of fragmentariness, historical setting, grading, literary forms, and the problem of being honest in our representation of the Bible, yet preserving its authority as revelation. In his treatment of the growth of persons,[81] he praises the insights recently gained through child study regarding the learning process, but warns of the pitfalls to be encountered should the whole end of our programs become child centredness:"A curriculum, religious or secular, based on the needs of the child is in danger of becoming a very thin and watery curriculum particularly if much weight is allowed to what the child himself considers to be his needs."[82] He points out the need for a recovery of a Christian view of man, in light of false views that prevail, and that despite the contention between the views of growth into faith and conversion, both are, in the larger meaning of each, valid aspects of Christian education. One of his most arresting emphases is a call to recollect that it is God who educates, and we only help to set the stage for the process. Regarding the Home, Smart, traces the decline of its influence as a Christian force in recent years, yet comments upon its conditioning potential,as emphasized by Bushnell. Smart points out that the loss in the Christian assertiveness of parents is tantamount to the loss of their authority with their own children since the only ultimate authority in any home is spiritual:

> What is needed is a consciousness on the part of the child that the parent is not trying arbitrarily to force his will upon him,but,rather, is concerned that each of them may find the solution of his problems that is right, and that together they may discover and fulfill God's will for then. It is when the child is forced by the parent's attitude to look beyond the parent to the God whom the parent unashamedly serves that the deepest respect for the parent's authority is generated.[83]

81 J. D. Smart, op.cit., p. 154, l. 19ff
82 Ibid., p. 155, l. 28ff
83 Ibid., p. 183, l. 16ff

Regarding public education Smart points out that secular humanism offers a threat to Christianity and that Christian reaction arouses fears on the part of educators that the church will break down the principles of separation of church and state. Smart is not inclined toward advocating parochial schools. The resolution of the public school situation he sees in grounding educators in a thorough acquaintance and appreciation of the Christian faith and enlisting their witness in the church's mission to the schools:

> The Church's first task, then, is to produce Christian educators, men and women who are active, intelligent Christian disciples, and at the same time competent in the field of education, who can command respect not only by the integrity of faith but also by the high quality of their educational workmanship. We ought not to pin our hopes of influencing education upon one hour a week of Bible teaching, but rather upon twenty five hours a week of cultural activity based upon and impregnated with Christian principles. If Humanism has gained the upper hand in many of our schools and among philosophers of education, then one must ask, What have fifty million Christians been doing to let themselves be outthought in this way? The remedy is not to start a futile war on Humanists in education, but to outwork and outthink the Humanists in the educational task.[84]

Summing up, Chave and Thayer have presented interesting views to contend with. Christian education, however, can hardly take them very seriously, without ceasing to be Christian. Of the latter four views only Harner and Smart have really spoken to the Christian education problem. Smart's treatment is a wider treatment of the subject, but Harner's views have been considered in terms of shorter writings. Harner has adopted more of a point of view of reconciliation, Smart, a polemic. All contain some excellent views for enlightenment of aspects of the total situation.

---

84 J. D. Smart, op.cit., p. 203, l. 5ff

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

A review of the Christian Education scene after a study of the problems at the local level, the history of its rise, its relation to state and general education, and the views offered on it from a variety of sources, indicates a problem that runs the whole gamut of religion and philosophy. The problem of Christian Education is of church, home, school, and state relevance. It is different to the leader who must see it in relief against life as a whole and size it up accordingly, from what it is to the follower who may be more content to fit into his niche and follow direction and tradition without much question. In the wider concern Christian Education causes the question to arise as to whether God is as the Christian view, the theistic view, a philosophic principle,or whether man is to become humanistic or naturalistic, and altogether reject supernaturalism and the reverence of man for a supreme being. It gives rise to the question as to whether things can be pointed out that are centrally true assumptions or generally self-evident facts. It raises the question of where the responsibility for education lies. Is it with the home, the school, the state, the church, or a combination of any or all of these agencies? Is man set in eternity or in the temporary only? Can moral-social-spiritual values be sufficiently inculcated without religion and personal commitment to God? Can the educational functions of the church and the state be separated? It raises the question of the

differing legislations in various districts and countries. It raises the matter of contending with historical feelings of the past. It raises questions over the interpretative differences regarding the Bible. It raises the matters of method and curriculum, atmosphere and personality, mind, will, and emotion in education. Shall curricula be individual-centred, content-centred or experience-centred? Very significantly, it also involves a general indifference on the part of many to seeing a a need to change from previously existing approaches at all. The facts show that there is controversy in religious education in whatever phase one would examine. In this general sense Christian Education raises the question of whether one should be Christian, or of some other religion, or a blend of religions.

To Christian education in the more limited and practical sense this is hardly the question, although Christian education is self-criticizing. The conviction of Christians is that in its present form the fundamental beliefs that Christianity embraces it needs. It stands to gain little by blending with other religions. Therefore, the position stands that Christians believe in a spiritual,sovereign and living God who was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. Christians believe that the Bible is the unique gift of God for the understanding of the operation of his will with and for man. Christians believe that great values have been commited to their company through their past experiences and in decisions of their church. Christians believe in eternal life and that in this life man is a being with a destiny to live in such a fashion as to create a world of spiritual and creature-to-creature relations

that are ordered with reverence and sound regard for one another, within the over-arching, personal, love and goodness of God. By seeking to strive faithfully to be true to the mind of Christ, man prepares himself at God's bidding to live a life of this dimension eternally. This adds the values of worth, character and continuity of life. He is free to supply his real needs[1] and freer to find genuine joy.

Christian education, however, has extensive understanding and discipline to impart. Her own house is not without division. Consequently, it is apparent that we need a comprehensive approach to meet the variety of matters to which we must be able to answer. It is not enough that we blindly teach about the Bible and moralize occasionally about beliefs. Behind it all we need a philosophy of education, direction, plans to utilize various media of education, plans in respect to church-state relations, and an overall curriculum for Christian education in the home, school and community.

Our Christian education needs to familiarize people with the terminology of worship and with the spirit, attitudes and enjoyment of worship. Our Christian education needs to consider sound theological hymns and music. It needs to be implemented at all age levels, employing common repetitive themes, theoretical and practical situations. It must appeal to the individual's happiness, wholeness of life, health, worth, relationship to God, social security and total prosperity.

Centrally, we need a theology; one that takes into account the contributions that other fields of knowledge such as biology, geology and

---

1 Matt. 6:34

psychology have to contribute. We need an interpretation of the Bible that sees it in a genuine historical and rational perspective, but we also need to preserve its position as an authority. We need to preserve an awareness of the great availability of the power of life in God. We need to preserve the emphasis on the eternity and love of God, and the way of life in the spirit of Christ that leads to fulfilment. We need to preserve a sense of reality in recognizing the difficulty of the application of the spirit of Christ to daily living. The theology which we teach must surmount the problems of the Old and New Testaments where poetry and symbolic language, literally interpreted, conflict with general learning. It must surmount the problems of established traditional doctrine and general learning. It must be prepared to take a stand. First, a positive stand for itself. Secondly, a negative stand toward ultra conservativism and absolute legalism. Thirdly, a restraint toward ultra modernism, total skepticism, and humanism.

Our first attention, then, must be given to theology -- a theology of purpose. It is of great significance that Christian education should lend a sense of purpose in the midst of this age that is so frequently raising the question of the purpose and meaning of life. Our education must be shot through with a sense of God's purpose for life. Our teachers must exhibit a sense of having grasped it. It is important that we realize God's purpose is a particularly important truth. We have the task of indicating in a world of varied sources of information often in conflict with one another, that this Christian truth about life is the integrating factor of all the truths that man discovers. We must present

it convincingly, so that men may be able to establish a relative scheme of values through which to establish a sound perspective on life. There are no more profound statements of the integrating truth of life than that God is a spirit,[2] that God manifested in Christ is loving in a manner beyond any measure we have,[3] that God is one to be loved and our neighbours as ourselves,[4] that the chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever.[5] Since these points stand supreme as integrating truths of life, our theology must appoint other biblical truths to assume their relative importance around these central facts. Likewise, the general truths from other fields must assume their rightful positions in regard for the sovereignty of this thought. This measure, however, must not be abused so that it discredits the validity of any other phase of the truth. We must guard against the tendencies to refuse to accept the gifts that knowledge from scientific observation has to offer in its field of authority. More frequently, however, we are held to a position where, due to the pressure of the widespread favor given to scientific thought in this era, we must not fail to convey that theology is commissioned with the truth that binds the other truths together.

This leads us to the second emphasis needed in our theology -- to stand for an adequate theology of God. We are frequently confronted with suggestions of conceiving of life in terms of naturalism. Some of this is directed toward the argument of showing that religion is a natural

---

2 John 4:24
3 John 3:16
4 Matt. 22:37
5 The Shorter Westminster Catechism.

function of the human being and as such might pass as reasonable theology in some schools. However, more seriously the term is used to denote a suggestion that there is nothing in life beyond what is perceptible by the common senses, discrediting a human capacity for spirtual perception, or anything existing to be perceived by this method. This kind of thinking perceives of life force as a naturally existing factor, but with no particular meaning or ultimate direction, other than that which we impart to it by our own choices and existence. Concession is made to its pre-existing man and its incomprehensibility, but no credence is given to its possession of personal,sovereign will or mind. It undercuts the very basis of the eternal significance which we attribute to personal human relations. Life force becomes a thing to be considered, but in no way personally (as opposed to mechanically) related to the direction of our lives. It is, as it were, a quantity assumed, but hardly a quality. It is a real quantity, but except for an outward similarity to man's own drive entirely independent to him. It becomes just one of the many factors which man considers and uses, rather than its employing man himself. Life becomes the living of an appointed time without ultimate meaning or personal significance. To these sterile assumptions about the nature of God we must answer with an adequate theology.

It must be made clear that no matter what arguments may be marshalled for conceiving of life in terms of naturalism,there is a need to recognize a personal concern within life's force--that God has a personally important destiny for His created. This is anecessity if individuals are to be in a growing harmony within themselves and the universe. This is something which

man cannot explain in terms of physical reference, empirically demonstrable data, or himself. Unless one is to consider the spiritual world an already assumed, natural, and sovereign quantity,one cannot regard life without reference to supernaturalism. Naturalism, in the limited sense of the word (meaning that which can be described in terms of the physically demonstrable) is insufficient as a basis for the explanation of life. Man is forced to accept faith in things that only find themselves demonstrable in terms of the emotions. These experiences we have discovered no key to describing in a language such that they can be spoken of with exact reproduction of meaning so as to be readily perceptible to every hearer. Nevertheless, with application grasp is attained. Though we have no desire to discredit the contributions of science or further the misconception that religion and science cannot be reconciled, when the latter is interpreted to mean the knowledge which accrues from the objective observance of natural phenonena, then we must contend that the perception of the truth of God is beyond science; that, indeed, science and religion concern themselves with different realms and approaches, neither one way being sufficient to arrive at the knowledge of the other. Further, when truth about God becomes the subject, it is religion that has the greater approach and the commission to administer it.

On this point, then, our theology of God is summed up. Man must know that life is divinely ordained with a divine purpose. In the face of controversy this continuity with the past and relevance to the present we maintain. Ours is a teaching of God - personal, like Jesus Christ, of His divine purpose, and of the personal importance of human life.

The third emphasis in our theology must be to cover our relationship to more subjects. (This is especially true of the United Church of Canada). To find a good theological grasp one must refer to extractions of one theological school and another, and often lift them out of their context. We have not come up with a sufficiently comprehensive, single consistent theology for Protestant Christianity. The church must address itself to the task of a complete review of the entire heritage of Christianity that takes its root in a greater outlook than that of the reformation or Augustinian thinking. It must contend with all the theological and philosophical involvements of today. Here lies dormant the cause of a true liberalism. In its previous zenith an oversimplied liberalism gave hope that minds believed that such could be done. Still the cause evidently has not had sufficient time in which to find a proponent to produce that theology. The ecumenism of our day is a practical, open invitation to such work. The relevance in the present theological disposition is almost beyond exaggeration.

Our fourth emphasis is to turn our minds to a direct consideration of a reconciliation with general knowledge as earlier mentioned. Ours might be described as an age of strong ideologies. Therefore, in the interests of peace we must consider more than asserting our own rightness, but also of granting fitting recognition of knowledges in other fields. The battle between certain antiquated and erroneous concepts of religious traditions and fields of general knowledge has been well waged already. We can ill afford to perpetuate discord over supposed differences in fields of thought which are mere projections of prejudices in the favor of one

school over another, and a refusal to employ more than one approach to truth even when wisdom clearly indicates that we should.

Fifthly,we need to consider the mind of the layman. We live in a day when the layman is also a mind with which to contend. He may not live as religiously constrained a life as the clergyman, but he knows what he will accept and what he will not. His preferences are frequently not altogether without reason. He has a freedom which we cannot presume to unsurp and often good sources of information and training to couple with the faculty of critical thinking. We have a need therefore to take the layman's expression of theology into account in establishing the definitions of our truth - the base of our educational approach. This is especially relevant since they are likely to be doing most of the teaching. The layman is not inclined to be overly sympathetic with too much classical expression, or with traditions, doctrines and expressions that have no readily perceived meaning today. If we are to do a service to this age that as a whole is so potential a Christian influence, we must present a theology which it can embrace without great misgiving. If we do not it will be to their loss, ours and the cause of God. We must place our Christian education on a theological basis that is acceptable to the layman and the theologican, in their respective fields of knowledge and experience. If we do possess the integrative truth of life, its integrative qualities must be readily demonstrable and that cannot be done with a message that is historically outmoded and needlessly in conflict with other acceptable thought around us. Our world is set in an outer space outlook and experience that daily draws us closer to the vast order

of systems beyond us, making it harder to hold simple pictures of the relationship of the spiritual world to ours. The contrast of today to older concepts is a more startling conflict to the layman than to the theologian. The latter is already disciplined to reconciling himself to the various biblical cosmologies encountered in his studies without becoming seriously disturbed. However, the modern milieu of the layman as it affects his thought is an important consideration.

Finally, we need to elaborate a detailed policy of our attitude toward the state and state institutions. Theologies of protestant churches have all too often been too limited to deal with statements of attitude toward the state, in particular the democratic state and its institutions. In order that we shall be equal to situations that arise we must evolve such positions. In the case of Christian education and public schools we have legislation to the effect of the separation of church and state,but does our church accept that legislation as being particularly desirable. This is ultimately important in considering the best interests of Christian education. Can we impart Christian truth significantly apart from utilizing the mode of, and piercing general education throughout with Christian philosophy? Can Christianity operate within the limited sphere of church and home, and significantly impart its program of the integrating of knowledge. If we can embrace the present church and state policy, then we must have concluded that the church and home are adequate. If we cannot so agree, then we must enter the public school curriculum philosophy in opposition to the policy of the absolute separation of the church and state.

If we can handle these basic theological needs which must be implicit in our Christian education approach, the matters of media, method, arrangement of curricula, grading, and the like can be handled adequately. If they are not, no amount of juggling will be satisfactory. This thesis began with the assumption that an adequate theology was required for a significant Christian education. After the reviews of this paper the need appears more strongly established than ever.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Department of Education: Bulletin 1, Foundations of Education. Edmonton. A. Shnitka, King's Printer, 1949.

Alberta Department of Education, Senior High School Curriculum Guide for Social Studies 10 and 20, Edmonton: 1953.

Bailey, Thomas A., "Amendments to the Constitution (U.S.A.)" Article 1. The American Pageant. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co. 1956.

Bushnell, Horace, Christian Nurture. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Chave, Ernest J., A Functional Approach to Religious Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Dawson, Robert MacGregor, "The British North America Act, 1867, Sec 93", Democratic Government in Canada. Toronto: Copp Clark Co., 1947. p. 155

Forman, Henry James and Roland Gammon, "Christianity", Truth Is One. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954, p. 83.

Harner, Nevin C., I Believe. Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1954.

_____, Youth Work In The Church. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942.

Henry, Carl F., "Christian Responsibility In Education", Christianity Today. I.17, 11 (May 27,1957)

Jeffery, Arthur, "The Canon of the Old Testament", Interpreters Bible. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952 1,32.

Leeson, Spencer, Christian Education. London: Longmans Green and Co. 1948.

Manson, T.W., A Companion To The Bible. Edinburgh, Tand T. Clark. 1950.

Murray, A Victor, Education Into Religion. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1953.

Religious Book Club Bulletin. A Review on An Approach to Christian Education. Davies . XXX, 8,4(July 1957)

Sherrill, Lewis J., The Rise of Christian Education. New York: MacMillan 1950.

Sparks, John B., The Histomap of Religion. Chicago: Rand McNally. 1952.

Smart, James D., The Teaching Ministry of the Church. Philadelphia. Westminster Press. 1954.

Thayer, V.T., Religion In Public Education. New York: Viking Press, 1947.

The School Act, Chapter 297 of the R.S.A. 1955 (including amendments to 1958) Sec. 391-92.

Young, W. Harold, "The Church and Education", The United Church Observer, XV, 11 (New Series) p.3. August 1, 1953.